National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVI. NO. 44. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 22, 1856. WHOLE NO. 824.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 *Nassau St., New York,*

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

Selections.

MR. HALE AND MR. PIERCE.

[Extract from Senator Hale's Speech on Kansas, in the United States Senate, February 26, 1856.]

WHAT followed the result of the invasion of Kansas—this going over of Missourians, as admitted and as shown? A law was passed; and I will read you that law, although it has been already read twice:

"If any person print, write, introduce into, or publish, or circulate, or cause to be brought into, printed, written, published, or circulated, or shall knowingly aid or assist in bringing into, printing, publishing, or circulating, within the Territory, any book, paper, pamphlet, magazine, handbill, or circular, containing any statements, arguments, opinion, sentiment, doctrine, advice, or inuendo, calculated to produce a disorderly, dangerous, or rebellious disaffection among the slaves of this Territory, or to induce such slaves to escape from the service of their masters, or to resist their authority, shall be guilty of a felony, and be punished by imprisonment, at hard labour, for a term not less than five years"—

but as much longer as the judge sees fit. The honourable Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Jones], in commenting upon this law, finds a little fault with it. He thinks it is not quite severe enough, but he says it ought to have been a penalty of death, and that every one offending against its provisions ought to be hung on a very high gallows—one as high as that old gallows on which Haman was hung. But, let us suppose the law to remain as it is; and let us suppose that a court was organized in the Territory of Kansas for the trial of offenders against this law: what would be done with a man who was found with a document in his pocket, reading in this way?

"The Southern people have NO RIGHT—natural, moral or political—to enforce slavery upon the new Territories. They have no more right to go there and hold slaves, than they have to do so in New Hampshire. THE SLAVEHOLDERS HAVE NO MORE RIGHT TO PLANT SLAVERY UPON FREE TERRITORY THAN WE HAVE TO ABOLISH SLAVERY IN SOUTH CAROLINA."

Do you not think that would amount to an "inuendo," to say the least of it? Who is the author of that sentiment? The editor of the *New Hampshire Patriot*. It is not one of his *post mortem* remains, but was published as late as the 28th of December, 1848. That is the declaration of the *New Hampshire Patriot;* and I suppose all of us know the relation which that paper sustains to the present Executive of the United States. If any Senator does not, he may find that one of his first official acts, after he was elected President, was to present to this editor a gold-headed cane, in token of the very high estimation in which he held him, and the manner in which he had discharged his duties. Do you not think a man ought to take five years for that? Would it not come up to an "inuendo, or advice, or opinion?" That was in 1848. Now let me go back one year. Suppose a man should be tried under this law, and this document were found in his possession?

"Resolved, That we declare it OUR SOLEMN CONVICTION, as the Democratic party have heretofore done, that neither *slavery* nor *involuntary servitude* should hereafter exist in any territory which may be acquired by, or annexed to, the United States; and that we approve of the votes of our delegation in Congress in favour of the Wilmot Proviso."

What is that? One of the resolutions passed at the Democratic State Convention of New Hampshire, in October, 1847. It must have been a hard dose for them, for I was one of those Senators whom they were thanking for voting for the Wilmot Proviso. Who were the committee that produced this resolution? I will read some of their names. Amongst the gentlemen who reported that resolution was "John S. Wells," the President's captain general and standard bearer, who is stumping the State of New Hampshire for the office of Governor to-day. He has some hopes of being elected, but, I think, more fears of being defeated, in about two weeks.

Another member of the committee that reported this resolution was Joseph H. Smith, a highly respectable gentleman of my own village. The President has shown his appreciation of Doctor Smith's patriotism, judgment and politics, by appointing him to the highly important office of inspector of drugs in the city of Boston, with a salary of $1,000 a year.

Another gentleman whose name I find among those who reported this resolution was Samuel Swasey. The President had such a high appreciation of his services, that he thought he must go a little higher than an inspector of drugs, and he was, therefore, appointed inspector and measurer at Portsmouth, with a compensation of over $1,200 a year. I also find upon the Committee who reported this resolution the name of another gentleman, Charles H. Peaslee, who has been rewarded by the President with the very lucrative office of "collector of the customs and superintendent of light-houses" for the port of Boston, with a salary of $6,400.

Well, sir, what do you suppose the *New Hampshire Patriot* said about the resolution which I have read, that was submitted by those gentlemen? In an article in that paper of November 4, 1847, it said:

"We never read a more able, eloquent and appropriate series of resolutions adopted upon any occasion; and there is one fact in this connection worthy of notice: *These* resolutions were adopted UNANIMOUSLY by the very able committee of twenty, after much deliberation, and were unanimously adopted by the Convention. And we put them forth as the DELIBERATE and MATURE convictions of the Democracy of this State."

How long shall these fellows take, sir? Will five years be enough? Certainly that goes beyond an "inuendo;" it must come up to an "opinion" [laughter]. That, you perceive, was in 1847. What next? In 1848—these men were inveterate sinners [laughter]—the Legislature of New Hampshire, with an overwhelming Democratic majority, passed the following resolution unanimously:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened,* That we are in favour of the passage of a law, by Congress, *forever prohibiting slavery* in New Mexico and California, *and in all other territories* now acquired, or hereafter to be acquired, by the United States, in which slavery does not exist at the time of such acquisition."

To how long a term of imprisonment, under the law which I have read, ought they to be sentenced for that? This was in 1848. Perhaps it will be said that they began then to reform. Let us see. In 1849, these resolutions were passed unanimously by the New Hampshire Legislature:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, That, opposed to every form of oppression, the people of New Hampshire have ever viewed with deep regret the existence of slavery in this Union; that while they have steadfastly supported all sections in their constitutional rights, they have not only lamented its existence as a great social evil, but regarded it as *fraught with danger to the peace and welfare of the nation.*

"Resolved, That while we respect the rights of the slaveholding as well as the free portions of this Union—while we will not willingly consent that wrong be done to any member of the glorious Confederacy to which we belong, we are FIRMLY AND UNALTERABLY OPPOSED TO THE EXTENSION OF SLAVERY OVER ANY PORTION OF AMERICAN SOIL NOW FREE.

"Resolved, That, in our opinion, Congress has the CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO ABOLISH THE SLAVE TRADE AND SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; and that our Senators BE INSTRUCTED, and our Representatives BE REQUESTED, TO TAKE ALL CONSTITUTIONAL MEASURES to accomplish these objects.

SAML. H. AYER, Speaker of the House of Representatives.
WILLIAM P. WEEKS, President of the Senate.
SAMUEL DINSMORE, Governor.

Who do you suppose introduced that proposition? Mr. Clement. And do you suppose that merit like his has been passed over by the President? No, sir; but he has been appointed by the president collector and superintendent of light-houses for the district of Portsmouth, and agent of the marine hospital there. Mr. Clement determined to put an end to this continual passing resolutions. He said to himself, what is the use of that? Here your are passing resolutions year after year on this subject. Now, said he, let us have done with it, and let us declare to all the world and to all time that we are unalterable. Other things may change; we never. We live in a granite State; our everlasting hills tower up higher than the clouds; they may crumble and fall, but the New Hampshire Democracy are unalterable; they will never turn [laughter]. And their unalterable position is, that they are "opposed to the extension of slavery over any portion of American soil now free." That was in 1849. What did the *New Hampshire Patriot*, the mouthpiece of the President, say then in regard to the subject? On the 26th of July, 1849, speaking of the doctrine of squatter sovereignty, then recently broached in a celebrated letter:

"The Democracy of the North never did endorse the doctrine, *and they never will.* The Democracy of this State are *unanimous* in the opinion, so far as we know, that *Congress has and should exercise the power, and exclude slavery* from California and New Mexico."

So far as they knew, then, there was not a man in New Hampshire who did not entertain these opinions. Did General Pierce entertain them? Why, sir, he was chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee during all this time; and he was the New Hampshire Democracy. It is idle to say, therefore, that he did not entertain these views. Again, the same paper says:

"Ever since the question of the extension of slavery to free territory was first broached, the Democrats of New Hampshire have opposed such extension. They have occupied but one ground upon the subject. In office and out, their united voices has been raised in behalf of the doctrine, that *territory now free should ever remain so.* Their Representatives in Congress have uniformly so voted, their Legislature has repeatedly so resolved, their Conventions have constantly so declared, their newspapers have always so spoken, their candidates have uniformly so expressed themselves, and their speakers have at all times and in all places so proclaimed. This has been, and now is, the ground upon which they stand; and *they will support no man who is not sound upon this question.*"

This was said on the 1st of March, 1849; but was the President of the United States cognizant of these opinions? Was he part and parcel of the Democracy that entertained these sentiments? Suppose you say, "This is not fair; this is a criminal trial; five years imprisonment in the penitentiary is the punishment for promulgating such sentiments, and it is not fair to send the President of the United States there, without some more direct testimony; this will not answer." Very well, sir; then I will read you an extract from General Pierce's speech, made at the North Church, in Concord, on the 5th of June, 1845, as reported in the *New Hampshire Patriot* of June 12, 1845, purporting to be in reply to one John P. Hale [laughter]. General Pierce said:

"He had only to say now, what he had always said"—

You perceive, sir, the Democracy of New Hampshire never change. They always profess the same thing—

"He had only to say now, what he had always said, that *he regarded slavery as one of the greatest moral and social evils—a curse upon the whole country; and this he believed to be the sentiment of all men of all parties at the North.*"

Ought he to get five years imprisonment for that? [Laughter.] Again:

"Mr. P. was free to admit that he had himself approached this subject of annexation [of Texas] with all the prejudices and prepossessions against it and ON ONE GROUND ALONE—ITS SLAVERY FEATURE. His convictions on this subject were, as he had stated, strong—not the result of any new light"—

Oh, no, sir! the President is no new light—

"but deeply fixed and abiding. THE ONLY DIFFICULTY IN HIS MIND EVER HAD BEEN, THAT OF A RECOGNITION BY ANY NEW ACT OF OUR GOVERNMENT OF THE INSTITUTION OF DOMESTIC SLAVERY; and he had found it extremely difficult to bring his mind to a condition impartially to weigh the argument for and against the measure."

That was in 1845, and therefore might come under the definition of a *post mortem* examination. It is ten years old; but I will take him at a later period. In 1851, there was a Constitutional Convention held at Concord, New Hampshire, for the purpose of revising the Constitution of that State, and General Pierce was President of it. On one occasion he left the chair, and made a speech, which was reported in the *New Hampshire Patriot*, in which I find this:

"*I would take the ground of the non-extension of slavery—that slavery should not become stronger.* But Congress have only re-enacted the old law of 1783. Union-loving men, desiring peace and loving their country, conceded that point—*unwillingly conceding it*—and, planting themselves upon this law against the outbursts of popular feeling, resisted the agitation which is assaulting all who stand up for their country. But the gentleman says that the law is obnoxious. *What single thing is there connected with slavery that is not obnoxious. Even the gentleman from Marlborough* [Dr. Batchellar] *cannot feel more deeply than I do on this subject.*"

The Dr. Batchellar here alluded to was one of the most prominent Abolitionists in the State—a member of the Constitutional Convention; and General Pierce said he could not feel the evils of slavery more than he himself did. That is certainly a "sentiment"; it is more than an "inuendo." Now, sir, suppose some faithful patriot, wishing to be booked up in the soundest politics of the country, should go to Kansas, and unwittingly take some of these documents with him, and suppose they should be found in his pocket, could anything less than five years imprisonment be inflicted on him; and might he not feel that he was under great obligations to the clemency of the court, if they let him off with that? The only limit is, that the punishment shall not be less than five years imprisonment, but may be as much more as the Court pleases.

But, sir, I will leave General Pierce. Suppose some unfortunate wight—one of those three thousand clergymen, for instance, about whom so much was said—should stray into Kansas with some little volume for his solitary reading in his pocket; and the constable should find it, and open it, and read this: "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." (Exodus, ch. 21, v. 16.) I do not say what that means; but in the hands of an uneducated black man, might it not have a tendency to produce a "dangerous disaffection"; and, if so, would it not come within the condemnation of this law?

Again, Sir: Suppose he did not take the whole Bible, but only took the New Testament; and suppose he should there read as follows: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are bruised." (Luke, ch. 4, v. 18.) I do not say what the meaning of this is; but might it not, with an uneducated black man, have a tendency to produce "dangerous disaffection," within the meaning of the statute which I have read?

Again: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him." (Deut., ch. 23, v. 15—18.) I do not give any meaning to this; but I only suggest whether this is not dangerous stuff to put into the hands of uneducated men, and whether it might not have a tendency to produce a "dangerous disaffection"? Would not a man be subject to the condemnation of this law, who should be be found with any such document as this in his pocket? The Senator from Tennessee said the provision of the law was not severe enough, but that the offence ought to be punished by death. Well, sir, there was a tribunal which sat more than eighteen hundred years ago, upon the Author of one of the sentiments which I have read, and that tribunal thought just so, and passed sentence of death upon him, and executed him.

MISS MURRAY AND SLAVERY.

THE papers have been filled with extracts from Miss Murray's book upon America. Her views upon the subject of slavery have been cited, and it seems to be thought that she came to America with strong anti-slavery sentiments, which, upon a closer inspection of slavery as it really exists in the South, she changed, and became by the force of conviction, in favour of the institution.

This is a mistake. Miss Murray was just as much an apologist for slavery when she landed in America as when she left it. She would still have been an apologist for it, had its workings been ten times more cruel than they are. Her peculiar theory is such as to compel her to the conclusions which she has adopted.

It is a little difficult to express the exact notions which Miss Murray holds. It should be borne in mind that she is an enthusiast in natural science, that she has picked up some knowledge upon several branches of science, and that she has adopted a grand theory, for which she is searching in all observations, and the confirmation of which she fancies she sees in all the facts and phenomena of nature. Although her theory is that of *progressive development* in the animal kingdom, it is not the theory of the "Vestiges," nor of the books. As nearly as we could understand it from her lips, her theory asserts that all matter proceeded from a primary state, the very lowest, by consecutive developments, *the identity of the matter* being preserved to the last. Thus a particle of rock becomes soil, then goes on into a vegetable state, then becomes a low animal, thence in gradual progression, passes through grades of merely animal existence, at last reaches the lower line of humanity, and becomes a man; and, then, still rising, it passes through the gradations of species from the lowest to the highest, and thence, upward, to whatever is next highest above man. Thus all the animal creation are travelling on, and will by and by become the human population of the globe, in remote ages. And each creation and each being must take the inconveniences and limitations of each stage of being, in the best manner that it can.

The moss of this age will be the flower of the next, the vine of the next yet, the animal by and by, then the man, and finally the civilized man. The most eminent men of our day were all once mere vegetables. We have all in the mysterious ages of our past existence been dogs, monkeys, savages. The presidents and judges, the statesmen and artists, need not hold their heads too lofty—they were all grass once, and moss, and mushroom. They have all crawled as worms, flown as insects, raced as quadrupeds, fought as savages.

Looking upon society in the light of this theory, Miss Murray would say of any section of men, your case may seem hard to you, but you are journeying on, and in due time will get out of this development into the one next higher; do not fret; you will be better off by and by.

It may well be conceived that with such a theory of man, his origin and destiny, her notions upon questions of right and wrong of practical humanity, would be somewhat peculiar. And no one should read Miss Murray's opinions in respect to the conditions of society and life, without bearing in mind the stand-point from which she observes and reasons.—*Henry Ward Beecher, in The Independent.*

FRENCH VIEW OF AMERICAN SLAVERY.

[Translated from The Journal des Debats for The Evening Post.]

In the last message of the President of the United States there are certain passages devoted to Europe, which have elicited a great deal of comment from the French journals. In the opinion of some, the threats directed towards England are the omens of a speedy rupture between the two countries; according to others, there is nothing, after all, in this cross-fire of insult and recrimination that is constantly kept up between the leading newspapers of London and New York but the vivacity of a free press, and it is for the very reason that there is such an ado made at the outset that there is so little real cause for apprehension in the sequel. This last opinion is borne out by experience. This is not the first time we have thought ourselves on the brink of an inevitable war, and yet all passed away with a few lofty, high-sounding, empty menaces. The English stand in the same relation to Americans that an elder brother does to a younger who has just come of age, and into the possession of a large fortune, and who is therefore very ready to give, though but little inclined to take, an insult; the two are always quarrelling; but just as they are on the point of drawing their swords, they happen to recollect that they are of the same blood and members of the same family. John Bull is generally the first to step forward with a proffer of reconciliation; and he seems to recognise and admire himself even in the faults and violent outbreaks of his brother Jonathan.

But there is another part of the message which has been thrown completely into the shade, and which, notwithstanding, is far more important than that in which the President gives vent to his martial ardour. We mean that portion of the message which treats of home affairs. In spite of its equivocal title, this is the chapter that most concerns the interests of Europe, both present and future. It is true that, in accordance with the euphemism of established precedent, the President only speaks of *domestic institutions* and of the right of each State to regulate its institutions of this nature as it may think best. But this undefined and undefinable hypocrisy of words conceals a fact of the greatest import—we mean the establishment of slavery in the new, and for the most part uninhabited, Territories. The Kansas question, as it is called, will perhaps decide the future destiny of the United States, and, judging from present appearances, will ere long involve that country in serious difficulty with Europe. It is time, then, to call public attention to the point at issue.

It is generally know that when, in the year 1819, the Territory of Missouri applied for admission into the Union, the public mind in America was strongly agitated all over the country; the people wanted no new State with a Constitution tolerating the institution of slavery. At that time no one dreamed of denying the right of Congress to exercise sovereign power over the Territories, and consequently to oppose the spread of those *domestic institutions* which are a disgrace to humanity and to the civilized world. The dispute was settled in the year 1821 by a compromise; an imaginary line was drawn 36 1-2 degrees north of the equator, and this was to be the line of demarcation between slavery and freedom; thus Arkansas, Florida and Texas were received into the Union as slave States, while Michigan, Iowa and Wisconsin came in as free. A compromise on such a question to the strengthening of slavery was a sad mistake, as time has but too well proved.

The Mexican war and the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, by adding immense territories to the United States and territories suituated above the 36th degree of latitude, menaced the slave States with the loss of that equality of suffrage in the Senate upon which they place their whole reliance, and which alone maintains and perpetuates the institution of slavery. It was evident that, out of those deserts, larger than France, Italy and Spain together, eight or ten new States were about to be formed, which would give an enormous preponderance to the cause of liberty in the councils of the nation. Already had California, in forming her State Constitution, given slavery the go-by. If the spirit of colonization, which has attained its highest development on the shores of the Pacific, were to allure free emigrants into all the countries between the Mississippi and the ocean, the doom of slavery would be irrevocably sealed, America would get rid of the cancer that was eating out her vitals, and would soon become the promised land of freedom.

The slave States were aware of the impending danger, and this accounts for all the fillibustering expeditions against Cuba. Cuba, could she have been conquered, would have given the Union three or four slave States, and counterbalanced the efforts of free emigration, which was spreading away to the North, over the new Territories of Minnesota, Utah and Oregon. This, too, explains the political agitation which for the last few years has marked the course of American legislation—an agitation which was brought to a close in the year 1850 by the abandonment of the Missouri Compromise, and by the adoption of a clause introducing a new principle into the Federal Constitution. The sovereignty of Congress over the Territories was transferred to the Territories themselves, and to these States in embryo was conceded the right of regulating their *domestic institutions* as they should think best, or, in other words, the right of admitting or rejecting slavery. The condemning these poor people to perpetual servitude was no longer looked upon as a crime; it was considered a question of trifling moment, which was properly left to the decision of those whom it most interested.

At the same time, that nothing might be wanting to render the triumph of the South complete, the Fugitive Slave law was incorporated into the compromise of 1850—that is to say, a law permitting the Federal Government to seize, within the limits of free States, slaves who had escaped from their masters. Thus, while at the North State sovereignty was being infringed upon and weakened to promote the interests of slavery, the same sovereignty was enlarged in Southern Territories for the introduction into them of the peculiar institution.

The South, then, had triumphed in the sad compromise of 1850, to which Mr. Clay attached his name, but it is the destructive characteristic of injustice that every one of its victories but hastens its own destruction by aggravating the disease it is sought to cure. It had required all the care and skill of a great statesman to hold up this towering structure of iniquitous laws—a few pages, written by an unknown Christian woman, sufficed to level it with the ground. Uncle Tom is certainly not a literary *chef d'œuvre;* it is more than that: it is a noble action.

Since the appearance of this book, the hatred of slavery has been constantly gaining ground in the free States. Theodore Parker, with all the violence of a Roman tribune, has attacked this odious system of legislation. All the Eastern States refuse to assist in the *extradition of the refractory,* as the honied language of the Message has it; and in the delivering up innocent fugitives from servitude, they see nothing but legal complicity and licensed infamy. That is what the President calls, in his Message, "not fulfilling their constitutional obligations on account of a blind prejudice"; for, at the present day, words have entirely changed their meaning at Washington. The good citizens and saints are those who defend the peculiar institution, while the criminals are those who demand the freedom of their fellow-beings in the name of the Gospel and of humanity.

Next comes the Kansas question, which is now engaging the attention of Congress, and threatening the stability of the Union. Kansas is a Territory lying between the thirty-seventh and the fortieth degrees of North latitude, between the State of Missouri and the Territory of New Mexico. Planters from Missouri and Arkansas have, from time to time, established themselves in it with their slaves, or merely visited it long enough to deposit their votes, and thus influence the Territorial elections. Emigrants from the North also settled in the Territory, carrying with them their ideas of freedom. Threats were exchanged, and in last December the little city of Lawrence, where the friends of liberty had taken refuge, came near being carried by storm. There seems, unfortunately, too much reason to believe that the owners of slaves are now in the majority. If they carry the day, and Congress admits the new State into the Union, Nebraska and New Mexico will soon follow Kansas's example, and there will be, from the Mississippi to the Pacific, one uninterrupted line of slave States, which will confine liberty to the limits of the North, and assure the preponderance of the South.

We can all of us imagine how fierce will be the struggle on the floor of the present Congress, from the fact that, for nearly two months, Congress was unable to organize by the election of a Speaker. The reason of this is evident: this is the battle-ground on which the two parties are to measure their strength. Mr. Banks, who has the largest number of votes, sees in the clause of 1850 the effect of a hasty onslaught on public opinion, and opposes the admission of Kansas, as incompatible with the principles of the Missouri Compromise; his adversary, Mr. Richardson, sees, on the contrary, in this admission, the real application of constitutional guarantees, and between these two candidates, at the head of a political minority, stands a third in Mr. Fuller, who is beating on and off, and will not commit himself in a crisis where indecision is so eminently out of place.

Rarely has a greater struggle taken place in the councils of a nation; it is nothing more nor less than the future destiny of liberty that is about to be decided. But one would hardly imagine so, in reading certain passages, wherein the President has nothing but insults for those who want neither a Fugitive Slave law nor the admission of Kansas.

"If," says the message, "the passionate rage of fanaticism and partisan spirit did not force the fact upon our attention, it would be difficult to believe that any considerable portion of the people of this enlightened country could have so surrendered themselves to a fanatical devotion to the supposed interest of Africans in the United States as totally to abandon and disregard the interests of the twenty-five millions of Americans—to trample under foot the injunctions of moral and constitutional obligations, and to engage in plans of vindictive hostility against those who are associated with them in the enjoyment of the common heritage of our national institutions.

"I know that the Union is stronger a thousand times than all the wild and chimerical schemes of social change which are generated one after another in the unstable minds of visionary sophists and interested agitators. I rely on the patriotism of the people, on the dignity and self-respect of the States, on the wisdom of Congress, and, above all, the continued gracious favour of Almighty God, to maintain, against all enemies, whether at home or abroad, the sanctity of the Constitution and the integrity of the Union."

We know not what effect was produced in America by such language, but it is to be feared that to the people of the Old World this appeal to justice and to Providence will look more like blasphemy than anything else. Is it true, as the President tells us, that if this agitation continues much longer, the people of the United States will be ready to dissolve the Union? We doubt it very much; and still more so when we reflect that it is the favourite policy of the South to talk of secession in order to cover her private with the mantle of the general interest. We think as does Channing, in his admirable tracts on slavery, that there is a leaven in the old Puritan Colonies of the East, and in the Western States, that will sooner or later set the whole mass to fermenting. There is too much honour, too much religion, too much virtue in them, to think of enduring forever this Mezentian torment. Every day the cup of injustice is slowly filling, drop by drop. When will it overflow? That is known of God alone.

But has Europe nothing to do but look calmly on and watch the drama that the ambition and cupidity of man are now playing on the other side of the Atlantic? Is she entirely unconcerned in an affair which, to our mind, is more pregnant of danger to the future than was even the Eastern question?

Let us reflect a moment. We are in the full light of the nineteenth century, and in a republic, across the sea, in a country that styles itself Christian, is now being discussed the question, not as to whether a disease, well-nigh irremediable, is to be endured or extirpated, but whether this disease shall not be transplanted to a soil where it is now unknown, and where not a shadow of a pretext exists for introducing it. To satisfy the South, to calm its fears or to quench its inordinate thirst for gold, millions of human beings must be plunged into slavery, ignorance and degradation; civilization must be thrust back and the Bible be trampled under foot, that the minds of few Arkansas planters may be set at ease, that Virginia may get rich by raising negroes, and that Mr. Pierce may be reelected.

The President waxes eloquent over the independence of the United States, which, says he, exhaust their strength neither in foreign nor in civil wars, and loudly declaims against all European intervention in the affairs of the New World. Perhaps his zeal misleads him a little in the latter particular, and the Kansas bill may be destined to bring about the very change in European policy that the United States so much dread. The world is no longer either European or American. There is something else besides mere territorial lines and demarcations, which steam is blotting out every day. The world is christianized and civilized, and for this reason no power on its face is uninterested in what is passing in the United States.

Europe saw with indifference the finest provinces of Mexico wrested from a country which, for the past three centuries had not known how to avail itself of the blessings lavished upon it by Heaven. Thanks to the liberal policy of the United States, those long-deserted shores were thrown open not alone to America, but to all mankind. California is an additional star on the flag of the Union, but it is none the less a Colony accessible to all in quest of fortune or a livelihood. Who, then, can envy this prosperity, in which every one is directly or indirectly interested?

But is the case the same if, in the newly-acquired Territories of the Union, a new Roman Republic is to be reared, with the institution of slavery underlying it as a foundation? Is there no reason to fear that slavery, after its introduction into Kansas, will find its way into New Mexico, and thence, by an easy gradation, slope away to the south, till it finally reaches the Isthmus of Panama? Shall we witness, in the present century, the spectacle of two distinct and antagonistic forms of civilizations—the one assuming Christian equality for its standard, the other demanding its laws from ancient Rome, and possessed of all the pride, ambition and inhumanity of these old masters of the world? As it is no longer civilization, but slavery, that the conquerors draw in their train, will not Europe feel surely called upon to check the United States in its career of triumphal aggression? President Pierce's Cabinet has declared that it would consider the enfranchisement of slaves in Cuba as a *casus belli.* The South cannot tolerate the vicinage of freedom. Shall Europe be less sensible to the dangers that menace the tranquillity of the future, and deem that the conquest of Mexico and the establishment of slavery are no business of hers?

And even though the United States should have nothing to fear on this side of the Atlantic, though no obstacle were to impede the onward march to conquest in which she is now incessantly urged by the greediness of the South, she can but know that she has inflicted on herself a more terrible calamity than could possibly happen to her from a war with Europe. With a free and admirable form of government, she was at once the model and the envy of the Old World. She was the common mother of all high-minded, generous spirits—she was the hope of the future. At the present day, by becoming the advocates and the propagandists of slavery in the midst of a civilization based upon the idea of the perfect equality of all, by departing from the principles of Washington, Jay and Franklin, the Americans have mistaken their sacred mission, and have inflicted a terrible blow on the cause of civil and religious liberty. Their moral standard has been lowered. To the great joy of the enemies of freedom, public opinion in Europe is setting strongly against America. With ten millions of inhabitants, the United States in 1815 were really greater and more respected than they are at present. The example they held up to the world, and the authority of the real heroes of humanity, to whom they were indebted for their institutions, constituted by no means an insignificant feature of their greatness. America was for us the country of Washington. A few short years, and, lo! what a change! When Austria is emancipating the last of her serfs, when Russia is thinking of doing the same, how shall we class the free people which not only defends slavery, but carries and plants it where it had never existed?

The President's friends applaud the clearness and precision of the message; we know not what may be the success of this document to-morrow, but there is one thing of which we are certain, and that is that the President has covered his name with ineffaceable infamy, and that, if the Kansas bill triumphs, the name of Mr. Pierce will be inscribed, not underneath those of Washington, Jefferson, and their noble compatriots, but among those who have failed to realize the obligations imposed on them by such a succession, and who, through weakness or design, have humbled the glory of America, and proved traitors to the cause of justice and liberty.

EDOUARD LABOULAYE.

A SLAVE SALE IN RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

MAY I give your readers a brief sketch of one or two scenes I have witnessed to-day? Here is a row of well-dressed girls, from 15 to 20 years of age, awaiting their turn to ascend the auction-block or table, while a group of men and boys are being sold. They are surrounded by a group of sensual-looking men, young and old, asking them all sorts of immodest and impure questions—feeling their ancles, arms and bosoms—while those trembling, sensitive ones have no power of resistance. Now their turn comes to ascend the table and be placed under the auctioneer's hammer. Nora is called for. She ascends the steps, and for the time being is the observed of all observers. She is dressed with true artistic skill, to set off her fine form; flowing sleeves, which are soon to be thrown back to display the gracefully-rounded arm; a nicely wrought stomacher of the whitest cambric; her raven hair trimmed with ribbons; a slight dash of African blood can be seen in her cheeks, which only increases her beauty; lecherous-looking men gather closer, anxious to secure the prize; and now the auctioneer begins—"What is bid, gentlemen, for this beautiful girl? Only sixteen; sold for no fault; brought up in a genteel family; right and title good; warranted sound every way. What is bid, gentlemen? Six hundred dollars, I hear! six! six! six! six! six!—" "Fifty!" "Thank you; six hundred and fifty dollars is bid. Seven hundred I hear—seven! seven! seven! going for seven hundred dollars; seven—" "Twenty-five!" "Seven, twenty-five!—seven—" "Fifty!" "Seven, fifty—do I hear any more? Why, gentlemen—mark her beautiful form! See her well-shaped foot and gracefully-turned ancle!"—at the same time raising her clothes above her knees, while a shout of approbation greets him from the gazers around the table beneath. Now the bidding goes on, under the excitement of this exposure of her person, brisker than ever. It reaches $900, and then another move is tried. She is taken down, the men are made to fall back, and a path is made to the furthest side of the building; and between those files of men she is made to walk briskly backward and forward. "Hold up your head, miss; walk pert, now, as if you were going to church to meet your beau! See there, gentlemen, there is muscle for you; the real Baltimore clip! step as light as an antelope's. What is bid, gentlemen?" While she is thus walking the gauntlet of these rude men, any one that chooses may stop her and handle any part of her body, ask her any question he chooses; then, for the last time, she ascends the stand, and is soon knocked down to the highest bidder, at not far from $1,000. And this course is pursued by each, till all are disposed of. I might observe here, that the men and boys are taken into another room, a little before the sale, and are stripped naked, that their muscular developments may be better seen; and also, if they have any wounds or whip-marks on them.—*Cor. of The Tribune.*

For The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

BANKS ELECTED.

"CLOSE THE RANKS."

"Close the ranks, comrades. Victory clings to Unity."
Kossuth at Pest, 1848.

We have passed the second Decade
Of the struggle and the fight,
And the combat deepens round us
In the gloomy moral night

That envelopes all the Nation:
Like the darkness which, of old,
Round the stern, historic heroes,
In their classic battles, rolled.

But along the far horizon
There are signs of breaking light
Flashing upward, streaming outward,
On the darkness of the night.

"Close the ranks," ye moral warriors;
Close the ranks, by battle torn;
See ye not the blazing streamers
Giving promise of the morn?"

"Close the ranks," renew the battle,
For the combat still must be
Fought in Faith, the heart believing
What the *eye* may never see.

"Close the ranks," we *hear* the foemen
Falling round us, one by one:
And the World shall count the victors
At the coming of the sun.

Lo! it is the same old conflict
Of the Centuries ago:
Gather we, the Hosts of Freedom,
Round the still unvanquished foe.

Listen! in the conflict's pauses,
How the solemn minute-guns
Break upon us with the sorrow
For our valiant fallen ones.

Let us leave them! soft reposing,
Fame shall fold them to her breast!
Crown them with immortal honour!
Hold them in unbroken rest.

Close the ranks, where *they* have fallen!
Standing on each new made grave
Close the Ranks, surviving comrades,
At the calling of the slave.

CAUSE AND EFFECT.

As will be seen by reference to another column of our paper to-day, the slave case in Cincinnati has been decided, by Commissioner Pendery, against the fugitives. This case has excited considerable attention, in almost all parts of the country, in consequence of having been the cause of one of the most horrible and revolting incidents that has ever been recorded in the history of slavery. A mother has murdered her child, declaring that she would rather see it dead than to have it return to the bondage from which she had made a most desperate effort to escape. What a lesson for those dealers in human beings is contained in this one sentence! A mother murders her offspring to preserve it from slavery. We have no language in which to express our opposition to the institution which will thus affect the ties of affection between parents and children. But this is only one of the effects of this withering, blighting, damning curse upon our Country and our State. Mothers are driven to infanticide; fathers to self-destruction; children to lewdness and debauchery. Families are separated by masters, tearing women and children from their sires and husbands; the image of God is scourged and scarred by the lash and the plaited thong; the provisions of our national compact contravened; the principles of liberty and of justice violated without compunction; the foundation of all civil and religious liberty set at naught; and its demoralizing influences scattered broadcast over our whole country, drawing the very life-blood from the Government which fosters it.

They who are bound by the weight of its galling chains, and, trampled into the very dust by its demonizing power, whose operation is known only by its effects, receive no sympathy from persons professing Christianity, or, at least, no more than they might expect from the Anthropophagi; and thus, the teachings of the Bible and the professions of those who pretend to regard them as sacred can have no effect upon its course. No abuse can be found, search where you may, that may not either directly or directly be traced to this species of tyranny of the mind of man. If a slave belonging to the Church escape from his bondage to a place where he may enjoy, to the fullest extent, a religious liberty, he is instantly excommunicated; he is no longer recognised as belonging to the true faith; he can no longer be countenanced by the followers of that example of goodness and purity whom they call "Master." And yet, all these things are carried on under the garb of that meekness, mercy and charity which should be the result of a Christian religion.

The time has now come when this hypocrisy should be unmasked; when the policy of the nation should be roused from the sleep into which it is drawn by that demon, Error; the crimes of which Slavery has been the parent exposed to the refining fire of Justice, and the rights of man proclaimed. Let this one case be a warning for the future; and let all who have at stake the cause of humanity and justice look calmly at this instance of the barbarism of slavery, and, looking, learn to denounce a fraud, impiety and hypocrisy which would disgrace a nation of savages.—*Newport (Ky.) News.*

MORE OF THE FUGITIVE CASE.

DECISION OF JUDGE BURGOYNE ON THE MOTION TO DISMISS THE HABEAS CORPUS.

From The Cleveland Weekly Leader, Feb. 27.

LAST Saturday afternoon, Judge Burgoyne, of Cincinnati, in the case of the fugitives against Marshal Robinson, gave his decision on the motion of the defendant to dismiss the petition and writ of *habeas corpus.* After citing the defence set up, that the certificate of a United States Commissioner, agreeably to the latter clause of the eighth section of the Fugitive Law, "shall prevent all molestation of such person or persons by any process issued by any Court, Judge, Magistrate or other person whomsoever," and that this clause suspends the writ of *habeas corpus,* and, therefore, the Court had no jurisdiction in the case, Judge Burgoyne proceeds:

"The first question to be considered is, whether the clause referred to in the closing paragraph of the sixth section of the Fugitive Slave law, already cited, was intended by the Congress of the United States to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus;* and, if so, whether Congress had the constitutional power so far to do. Article first, section nine of the Constitution of the United States provides 'that the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it'; and precisely the same words were engrafted into the Constitution of Ohio in 1802, and repealed in the present Constitution of the State. This provision of the Constitution unquestionably renders void so much of any act of Congress as undertakes to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* in times of public tranquillity; and if the intention of the Fugitive Slave law was to place persons claimed as fugitives from labour, after the certificate of a Commissioner, beyond the reach of this great writ, so much of it as undertakes to carry out that intention is clearly unconstitutional. In this aspect of the case it matters very little what construction properly belongs to the language of the act of Congress. If it does not mean to place the persons, certified by the Commissioner to be persons owing service in one State and escaped into another, beyond the reach of the writ of *habeas corpus,* then the defendant's motion must be denied, because there is nothing in the law to support it. On the other hand, if the fair construction of the language of the act is such as to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* in the class of cases for which it provides, then so much of the act is in the teeth of the express provision of the Constitution, and utterly void.

"Judge Grier, in the remarkable case *ex parte Jenkins,* was of the opinion that the Fugitive Slave law was not designed

of the walls of the Old School Zion, they will tumble to pieces! Hence, when the naughty slaves of the pious and "orthodox" Mr. Gaines ran away, no less than eight of the corner-stones of this spiritual edifice were withdrawn. It must have reeled terribly under this sapping and mining process. Hence, Judge Leavitt and his brother Gaines have proved themselves devoted sons of the Church, in "chucking" these corner-stones again into their place under the walls of their Zion, and in draining off their heart's blood to cement its walls together. They ought to be "put into the ministry" at once; and some Southern Old School College should confer D.D. upon them forthwith.

But this subject is too grave and solemn for irony. The above is neither exaggeration nor caricature. It is a simple and truthful representation of the actual position in which the whole of the Old School Presbyterian Church is placed by the action of its General Assembly. For as the General Assembly is a *representative* body, it speaks for the whole Church, and its proceedings bind every man, woman and child who remain in its communion.

We write in no spirit of bitterness. There are thousands of honest, pious, freedom-loving Christians in that Church, who hate this transcendant wickedness as intensely as we do. We count a number of these among our readers and our personal friends. We love them as Christian brethren. But we do not believe that they have ever adequately conceived of the terrible enormity of the teachings and position of the General Assembly of their Church on this subject. The resolutions of 1845, quoted above, are so intensely wicked that they think, perhaps, they must mean something else. They are slow to believe—and this is very natural—that men whom they have regarded as pious ministers of the Gospel *could* take such a horrible position. But there stands the plain language of their resolutions, which means what we have said it does, or it means nothing at all. More than ten years have passed since these resolutions were adopted, and they stand now as the recorded and settled doctrine of the Church on this subject. Judge Leavitt and Mr. Gaines have acted in strict accordance with their letter and spirit in this Cincinnati tragedy; and the standing of these men in their Church will not be compromised in the smallest degree by an act which ranks in enormity along with the betrayal and crucifixion of Christ. Surely, *surely* the voice of God to *Christians* in *such* a Church is, "come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."—*Yellow Springs (O.) Free Presbyterian.*

MANUMISSION OF A SLAVE IN ENGLAND.

From The (London) Anti-Slavery Reporter.

We beg to call the attention of the friends of the anti-slavery cause in the United States to the statement submitted below, and to request them to use their best efforts to procure the insertion of this notice in as many of the American Abolitionist and other journals as possible. Our object in making this request is to place on record the fact of the subject of this notice having been manumitted by his late master, so that should the young man return to America, and unhappily lose his free papers, and in consequence be subjected to inconvenience, or be in danger of his personal liberty, there may be some readily accessible proof of his having been legally emancipated.

We cannot, perhaps, do better than first give his own account of himself, as handed to us immediately after he had obtained possession of his free papers. It is as follows:

"L. A. Chamerovzow, Esq.—*Respected Sir:* You wish me to put down in writing a few incidents of my experience of slavery during the time I was in bondage. I have nothing of any importance to communicate in that respect. It was my good fortune to have a humane master who treated me kindly, and being a house-servant, or rather slave, I saw nothing of plantation life; but what I did witness of the accursed system gave me a dread and abhorrence of the state I was placed in. Sir, you are too familiar with the cruelties and barbarities practised on slaves for me to say any thing on them here.

"I was born a slave. My father, Obit Bailey, was a freeman, but my mother Alice was a slave, owned by one Richardson, consequently I became the property of my mother's owner. I was raised in Carolina County, State of Maryland, and remained in slavery until I became a man grown. I am now about twenty-eight years of age. My slave's name was Philip Bailey; my freeman's name is James Francis Thomas. One Saturday night, when I was from home, my master was taken suddenly and seriously ill, and, after lingering a short time in severe pain, death put an end to his sufferings. He was a kind-hearted master to me, and I dreaded a change to a new master; so I determined to attempt to escape at whatever cost it might be, for I was convinced that nothing could be worse, come what might, after the kindness I had received from my deceased master. I felt that nothing could place me in a position of a more horrible character than to be in the power of a cruel task-master. I had always witnessed this, in the case of many of my poor fellow-slaves changing masters. I therefore started off one Saturday night in April, 1848. It was about ten o'clock, and I took the liberty to borrow my late master's horse, to facilitate my flight. I may here remark that my good friend, who conveyed me out of reach, got safe back to his stabling again. I have travelled many thousands of miles since, and should it ever be my lot to fall across the path of that horse, I guess I would most cheerfully give him a feed of corn for having been the first means of enabling me to land on the shores of Old England. About three o'clock in the morning I arrived at a village called, I believe, Smyrna, about 45 miles from Denton, the place where I was born; and after turning the horse loose, I sauntered about till six o'clock, when I walked quietly on board a small steamboat bound for Philadelphia which I reached the next day without molestation from any one. I remained there two or three days, when I received information from the Underground Railway officials that my young master was in pursuit of me, and making diligent search after me. Acting upon their advice, I dressed myself in woman's clothing, and took passage on board a steamer for New York, where I arrived in safety. I remained in that city a considerable time, and was fortunate enough to fall into good employment, and should have done well there but for that disgrace to America, the passing of that abominable Fugitive Slave law, which compelled me once again to resume my flight from the slavehunters. This time I made for the home of the slave and the land of the free, which I was successful in reaching—glorious Old England. Since then I have travelled the world over, and by the blessing of God saved up money enough to purchase my own freedom. When I get back to America I can set the slaveholders at defiance, for I hold in my right hand my papers of freedom, which I have purchased by the sweat of my brow. Thanks be to Almighty God!

"James Francis Thomas."

We have thought it best to give the above narrative as we received it from the writer. He procured employment as ship's steward, and having saved £40, placed the amount at our command, requesting us to negociate for his freedom. Through the instrumentality of Mr. Lewis Tappan, of New York, a proposition was addressed to Mr. Eugene K. Richardson, the late owner of Philip Bailey, who at length consented to make out his former slave's manumission papers, in consideration of receiving the said sum of Forty Pounds. We append a copy of this curious instrument, which to many of our readers will probably be quite a novelty. We would call their attention to its curious phraseology, and to the vague and specious manner in which the slaveholder refers to the "divers good causes and considerations" which moved him to release Philip from slavery. Not a word is said as to the kind of consideration he received, so that one is left to the conclusion that he manumitted his slave as an act of conscience.

COPY OF ACT OF MANUMISSION.

"To all whom it may concern: Be it known that I, Eugence De K. Richardson, of Cecil County, in the State of Maryland, for divers good causes and considerations me thereunto moving, have released from slavery, liberated, manumitted and set free, and by these presents do hereby release from slavery, manumit, and set free, my negro man, Philip Bailey, otherwise called James F. Thomas, being of the age of twenty-six years, and able to work and gain a sufficient livelihood and maintenance; and him, the said negro man named Philip Bailey, otherwise called James F. Thomas, I do declare to be henceforth free, manumitted, and discharged from all manner of service or servitude to me, my executors or administrators, forever. In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal, the tenth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-five (1855).

"Eugene De K. Richardson. (Seal.)

Sealed and delivered in the presence of us
Edmund Brown, Sen.,
John S. Rossell,
Caleb Parker."

ENDORSEMENT.

"State of Maryland, Cecil County, &c.: Be it remembered, and it is hereby certified, that, on the 10th day of October, eighteen hundred and fifty-five, before the Subscriber, a Justice of the Peace of the State of Maryland in and for Cecil County aforesaid, personally appears Eugene De K. Richardson, he being known to me of my own personal knowledge to be the person named and described as and professing to be party grantor to the foregoing or within deed or instrument of writing, and doth acknowledge the said instrument to be his act and deed. In witness whereof I hereunto subscribe my name on the day and year aforesaid.

"Edmund Brown, Sen., J. P."

"State of Maryland, Cecil County, &c.: I hereby certify that the within deed of manumission was received on the 10th day of October, 1855, and on same day recorded in H. H. M. No. 5, folio 341, &c., one of the Land Record Books of Cecil County aforesaid.

"In testimony whereof I hereto subscribe my name, and the seal of my office affix, this day and year aforesaid.

"H. H. Mitchell, C. R."

When the above document came into our hands, James F. Thomas was absent on a voyage. We received a line from him immediately on his return, and had the pleasure of placing his manumission papers in his hands in presence of the Lord Mayor, on the 2d of January ult. The fact was recorded as follows, in the *Times* of the next day.

"Mansion-House.—A gentleman, who is officially connected with the *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society*, waited upon the Lord Mayor, and introduced to the notice of his Lordship, Philip Bailey, a native of Maryland, who purchased his manumission from his master, one Eugene De K. Richardson, and submitted that the public notice of the fact in the press (particularly in the *Times*) might be of essential service to the poor man in the event of the loss of the document, or of other disaster, upon his departure from England. The applicant said that Bailey had laboured hard until he had put together $200, the price of his manumission; and having paid that sum for his manumission, he had, acting upon the advice of the Society, appeared before the Lord Mayor, that the document might be handed to him in the most public manner; the acknowledgment of which having been done would be a record of the fact, and might prevent future inconvenience or embarrassment, as it would be respected as conclusive testimony in the United States.

"The Lord Mayor said he had every reason to believe that the press would most gladly notice an application of the kind, and certainly he would not hesitate to express his gratification at being instrumental to the service of such a person as had made it.

"The document was then returned to Bailey, who retired, expressing his thanks to the Lord Mayor for the very kind manner in which he had been received."

THE PRACTICAL LESSON.

From The (Ohio) Anti-Slavery Bugle.

My Dear Friend: The Cincinnati tragedy is over, and the miserable victims of a wrong system and an atrocious law have been led back to slavery. We, whose feelings have been harrowed by the varying phases of that short but eventful drama, must now strive to learn a practical lesson, how to hasten the blessed period when such crimes against God and Humanity shall no longer desecrate our land, and make her a bye-word of reproach to the civilized world.

There is danger of our feelings being led away in a false direction and of our wasting on helpless and probably reluctant ministers of impassible law that indignation which should be concentrated on the system itself. For, allow slavery to exist in any part of this Republic, and the arm of Law and Force is necessary to keep down the natural tendency of the inborn spirit of Liberty to rise against this robbery of our dearest and most inalienable right. There must, therefore, be a law stringent in its provisions and relentless in its spirit, in order to prevent the escape of slaves or to force them back to the house of bondage. The present law is, perhaps, needlessly atrocious in some of its clauses; but, as a whole, it is the only law which could hold out to the masters something like security in their human property. This law must have judges and other officers to administer it, unbending as itself. As *judges* (I do not say as *men*), they are bound by their oaths and their office to administer the law consistently with its spirit and letter. Their private feelings must not interfere with their official duty. Hence those men who, to their own sorrow, I expect, were called on to decide on the fate of the slave mother and her children, could have taken no other view of the case.

Instead of blame, they deserve high credit as *judges* for the calm, lucid and logical manner in which they expounded and applied the law. I say they deserve credit in their judicial capacity. It is quite a different question, whether any man ought to accept or hold an office which compels him to act in opposition to the higher law of Christianity and human brotherhood.

Neither could the Governor of this State have interfered to oppose the due execution of the judges' decree. Like the sad and silent spectators of that worse than funeral procession, he could only look on and mourn in the secret of his heart. But, as head of the State, he was bound even to protect and assist the ministers of the law, had they been obstructed in their office.

What portion of good shall we then extract from this measureless sum of evil? This—that the time is past for compromises and the patching up of a hollow peace between freedom and slavery. They are incompatible. Modify the Fugitive Slave law and it becomes inoperative. No! There must be a total separation from the system of slavery. "No Union with slaveholders" must be our motto; whereby I do not mean a cessation from the kindly interchange of human charities; the slaveholders are our brothers however erring or blinded; and, could we consider their case calmly, we should, perhaps, find them entitled, almost as much as the slaves themselves, to our compassion for the manifold social and moral evils which the accursed system forces upon them.

But, in our individual and collective capacity, we, men and women of Ohio, should, henceforth, have nothing to do, directly or indirectly, with slavery. We should, indeed, redouble our efforts to create a healthy public opinion in the North, and to awaken the paralyzed conscience of the South so that they may at last put away the Evil Thing from among them. But, whilst abjuring all idea of rousing the bloody spirit of revenge among the slaves, or the use of any but moral force to extinguish slavery, we should proclaim to the world our determination to refuse all aid to slaveholding, all connivance with slavery; we must, as it were, ignore its existence and refuse to see in a runaway slave any other than a man and a brother, *free* by the imprescriptible law of Nature. We must ignore the possibility of a law which could empower a slaveholder to make of our free land his hunting ground.

If this *virtual* secession from the constitutional compromise between the slave and free States lead to an *actual* dissolution of the Union, let it come. We must regret seeing the fair fabric of Federal Union, once so full of promise, resolve itself into new combinations. We would do what we conscientiously could to prevent such a consummation; we will treat our guilty brethren of the South with all forbearance, we will bear with patience their taunts and violence; but we cannot, even to save the Union, allow ourselves and our children to be any longer implicated in their guilt, and to be placed in the cruel alternative of either violating our compact with the Constitution or sinning against the supreme Law of our God.

T. E. Sulliot.

Franklin, Portage Co., Ohio, March 11, 1856.

OHIO DISGRACED.

From the decision of Lord Mansfield in the case of Sommerset, in 1772, the fact that a slave once stepping into free Territory became instantly free, was never doubted or denied until some Courts of slaveholding States recently made the important discovery that if the slave did not claim his right *at the time*, such right would be forever lost to him afterwards.

The freedom of the slave in such a case did not depend on his entering free Territory by *consent of his master*. If once placed on free Territory by *any means*, whatever, he became *free*. It was this well-known and universally received law which induced the Convention that framed the Constitution of the United States, to insert the clause which provides "that no person held to service in one State and *escaping* into another shall be discharged," etc. They left the common law as it stood in regard to all slaves—except those escaping into other States. And the Court not only of the free States but of the slave States have recognised it and given it force and validity until recently.

But Commissioner Pendery holds that a master may bring his slave into Ohio, and hold him as a slave so long as he intends returning with him, and that he has a right to take his slaves through our State.

Now, we are a *law-abiding* people. But in making this assertion we should utter a flagrant falsehood, if we submitted to such decicions against law, against right, against common sense, against justice and the honour of the people.

In regard to the decision of Judge Leavitt. We say of that dignitary, as of all others, "there is a point beyond which forbearance ceases to be a virtue." To say that a slave may commit murder on the soil of Ohio, and that the master may, in defiance of our State sovereignty, take the murderer out of the hands of our officers, and carry him to the hell of slavery, is no less insulting to the State than were the reasons assigned by Judge Leavitt to the common sense of our people.

We repeat on this point the people of Ashtabula County would have *sustained the law*, against such a decision. They would have retained the murderess and permitted the Judge to go into slavery.

But Commissioner Pendery and Judge Leavitt are the merest parasites of the Slave Power, the miserable lick-spittles of the President and his party. Indeed, we see their servility is extolled by members of the Democratic party, who appear anxious to thrust these questions on us at the earliest moment. We call on Republicans to meet them; meet them boldly and promptly. Let the hissing sound of unutterable contempt rest on every man and every officer who would thus disgrace our State and degrade our people.

Thank God for these indications which leave us little room to doubt that one short year shall see a Republican President occupying the Executive Chair.

Then we hope to see such Doughfaces as Leavitt and Pendery driven from places of trust, and sent howling to their dens.—*Ashtabula (O.) Sentinel.*

The Savannah (Ga.) *Republican* states that several companies of emigrants from that State are about to start for Kansas, but that few, if any of them, are slaveholders, and that no slaves accompany them. The *Republican* doubts if even the votes of these men are to be safely relied on, and mentions the case of a party of nine who went last year from one of the upper Counties of Georgia, eight of whom afterwards voted with the Free State men. The same thing is true of the emigrants from Missouri generally, who vote against the invading ruffians from their own State. No amount of emigration likely to go from the South will make Kansas a slave State, if her people succeed in throwing off the fraudulent government forced upon them by outside barbarians, backed up by the National Administration.

Hon. John G. Palfrey has withdrawn himself from the political arena, and it is understood intends to devote the remainder of his life to literature. He is writing a history of New England, and will in a few weeks sail for England, in order to prosecute his researches in the archives of the mother country.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 22. 1856.

THE NEW YORK OBSERVER.

The course pursued by this paper is at once painful and instructive to the Christian. It is a journal professedly devoted to the support and diffusion of Orthodox Protestant Christianity, and in many respects is faithful to its profession. Yet the temper it manifests on a particular topic, and its wrath, malice and evil-speaking towards those who differ from him on that topic, are the reverse of what is required by the spirit and the precepts of the Gospel of Christ. All this is very painful, but it is also very instructive. It warns us to be especially on our guard against the sin that does most easily beset us. It teaches us that any one sin, rolled as a sweet morsel under the tongue, poisons the whole system in all that relates to, or in any way connected with, that sin. No matter how pure and orthodox is the creed professed, no matter how sensitive may be the conscience in regard to sins for which we have no mind, the one cherished sin paralyzes the moral sense on all subjects connected with that sin, and takes from the conscience the power of distinguishing between good and evil in regard to the means we use to favour our indulgence, or to effect our object. Isabella of Castile was naturally an amiable well-disposed woman, but religious persecution was her besetting sin, and she could torture and murder thousands, and yet flatter herself she was a good Christian and doing God service. The *Observer* thinks it is his mission to vindicate and uphold American Slavery. Hence his conscience in regard to the means he uses, and the slanders he pours on the opponents of slavery, is as obtuse as that of Isabella in regard to the murder of heretics.

Mrs. Stowe, in her famous "Uncle Tom," assailed the *Observer's* beloved institution. Blinded by passion, and regardless of the restraints imposed by morality and Christian courtesy, the *Observer* treated her with a scurrility and malignity little less than that which characterize what is denominated the "Satanic press." Her book, one of the most effectively pious works that has issued from the American press, was denounced as an anti-Christian book! Yet this same book was hailed with delight by the Christians of Great Britain, and by all in the United States, not contaminated by a pro-slavery bias, or interest. Soon, Mrs. Stowe and her slanderer both appeared in England. The former there made a triumphal progress, receiving from all classes, and especially from the religious community, honours never before conferred on an uncrowned female. The latter had been most improperly furnished with a commission to represent the American Bible Society at the anniversary of the parent institution. His pro-slavery championship and his abuse of Mrs. Stowe excited the indignation of the English press. He was despised and shunned, and prevented, by the force of public opinion, from appearing on the platform of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Hence England became identified by the *Observer* with opposition to slavery, and consequently the object of intense hatred. "The bulwark of Protestantism" does not find in Bishop Hughes a more rancorous opponent than in the very Protestant *New York Observer*. There is scarcely a number of the *Observer* that does not verify these remarks, but a very strong illustration of their truth is furnished in the number of the 6th March.

It is well known that, to the glory of English judicial justice, Sir John Paul and his partner have recently been tried and convicted of fraud, and sentenced to fourteen years transportation. Sir John belonged to the hereditary aristocracy and was nearly allied to two members of the House of Lords. Circumstances having delayed their embarkation to a penal colony, they were, in the meantime, committed to prison. It was soon discovered that, owing to their late social position or some other cause, their jailor allowed them favours not accorded to common felons. For his partiality he was dismissed and another appointed in his place. The new jailor warned by the fate of his predecessor, perhaps went to the opposite extreme. He converted the Baronet into a tailor, and Mr. Strahan into a chairmaker. The *Observer* quotes some remarks on this subject from a nameless English paper, but one which he says is a *religious* journal. The writer, after stating some extenuating circumstances in regard to the prisoners, objects to the employments assigned to them. He observes that prison employments, independent of the penalty involved in them, are intended to implant useful and self-supporting habits in the idle and untaught; but that the particular employment of these two men was intended solely for the purpose of insult and degradation. "Let the punishment," he says, "be as heavy as you please; *make it more onerous and terrible* than that inflicted on ordinary caitiffs. Let there be suitable employment, something that may be to fallen men of rank what tailoring and chairmaking are to fallen labourers; but let not the nation be seen insulting dignities in misery, and adding an unnecessary drop of bitterness to a cup of sorrows already wrung to the very dregs."

This sentence throws the liberty-loving, pro-slavery *Observer* into a paroxism of virtuous indignation. In spite of the proof afforded by the sentence and treatment of these aristocratic criminals, of the severe impartiality of English justice, and remembering the civilities bestowed on Mrs. Stowe by the Dutchess of Sutherland, he breaks out into a tirade against the respect entertained in England for the aristocracy. He tells us, "The Lord is flattered, treated with the greatest deference though he is a rake, and the humble, though intelligent and good must keep their places." The *Observer* is horrified that in *England* a rake in high life is treated with deference; how different in the United States! He is oblivious to the fact, that *we* have had a President and Vice-President, both flattered and treated with the greatest deference, and yet, each of them the father of mulatto children; and one of them an avowed and most malignant infidel.

But in England, "the humble, though intelligent and good must keep their places." Of course, in his opinion, things are very different here. Perhaps he has never heard of an humble minister of Jesus Christ, being taught in New York to keep his place, by being publicly expelled from an omnibus into which he had presumed to introduce himself. For information on this point we refer him to the Rev. Dr. Pennington.

The *Observer* tells us that in England "it is insisted by the religious press that 'fallen men of rank' ought to be treated in prison with greater leniency than those who sin under greater temptation." Thus a single anonymous paper is converted into the *religious press*. What would be the indignation of the *Observer*, should the London *Times* copy an article from the *Independent*, reflecting on the *Observer*, and represent it as the language of the religious press of the United States?

Another terrible instance of English corruption is cited in the same sheet. A young woman in the employment of a milliner was sent to a shop to buy an article. She proffered a coin which the shopman erroneously believed to be a counterfeit. He had her arrested on the suspicion of intentionally offering base money. A police officer took her to the station, where, in a private room, she was searched by a female, and no more money being found on her person, she was discharged. The shopman apologized in the newspaper, and offered her £10 as an atonement for his mistake. She refused the money and brought suit for false imprisonment. The Court charged strongly in her favour, and the Jury, under all the circumstances of the case, awarded her £20—about $100—for a few hours detention, and the injury done her feelings. The damages and cost probably amounted to $200, paid by the shopkeeper.

The *Observer* sneers at the "enormous sum of £20," and exclaims, "Is it not wonderful that in a country where the Gospel of Jesus Christ has been so long preached and professed, its spirit is so inadequately appreciated, wrongs against the poor and obscure are treated even in Courts of *justice* with less severity than if they were inflicted upon the rich. These are not the principles on which the divine government is administered; and we would hope that in England, at least, the religious influences of the country would be brought to bear upon that anti-Christian aristocracy which confers immunity upon crime and makes high born villany comparatively virtuous."

Rarely, indeed, do we meet with so much malignity and falsehood condensed in a single paragraph, nor one which manifests such an utter prostration of the moral sense. The very *facts* on which he comments disprove his reckless slanders. The English aristocracy, it seems, is anti-Christian and confers "immunity on crime," but it is the vocation of the *Observer* to vindicate the Christian character of the American aristocracy, consisting of about three hundred and fifty thousand men. This aristocracy virtually governs the whole country, and keeps in subjection between three and four millions of serfs. These serfs are denied every civil and religious right. The law no more recognises marriage among this vast multitude than among the beasts of the field. English aristocracy confers immunity on crime, as Sir John Paul can bear witness! A woman in England, falsely accused and arrested for an attempt to cheat, appeals to a Jury of her country, and recovers only $100, and this is owing to an anti-Christian aristocracy. Any member of the American Christian aristocracy may strip and flog a female serf suspected of stealing, and, should she carry her complaint before a Court of Justice, she would be rudely ejected from the Court, and again scourged for her impudence. For the greatest outrage that can be perpetrated on man or woman, no serf can recover, by process of law, one cent for damage. Any female serf may be subjected to enforced prostitution, and the law enacted by the aristocracy "confers immunity" on the crime. Long has the *Observer* laboured to prove that American Slavery is consistent with "the principles on which the Divine government is administered." Of course the Divine government is administered in England in very opposite principles. Thank God, the *New York Observer* is not "the religious press" of the United States.

MITIGATION OF SLAVERY.

There are always to be found persons who, disliking extremes, and feeling a horror of radicalism, plant themselves on a point half-way between right and wrong, and then cry out that they have found the golden mean, and confidently invite their neighbours on both hands to come to them and be saved. This farce has been played so often on the ground intermediate between slavery and anti-slavery, and has so invariably proved unacceptable to both, that a repetition of it would now be merely ludicrous to Abolitionists, did not their duty require a careful survery of such things, that the sophistries and falsehoods which make them plausible to a new examiner may be clearly pointed out and refuted. On this account it becomes necessary for us to notice a pro-slavery pamphlet of 118 pages, published in Boston near the commencement of the present year, and written by a clergyman (now a teacher, as we are informed) in Wareham, Mass.

This pamphlet is entitled, "Slavery and the Remedy; or, Principles and Suggestions for a Remedial Code. By Samuel Nott."

In an introductory sketch of the purpose of the pamphlet, the author assumes that slave-holding is an essentially different thing from slave-making, and is neither a crime nor a sin; that though it is an evil, or attended by evils, these would be aggravated, rather than mitigated, by immediate emancipation, which is therefore demanded neither by expediency nor duty; that though Colonization is a wise and beneficent enterprise, it does not fully meet the wants of the African race here, who are fixed, and must be provided for, chiefly on our soil; that the responsibility for action on this subject rests not with the United States, but with each slaveholding State, separately; that *their* attention should no longer be directed to *mere* slavery, or *mere* abolition, but to the *well-being* of a people *providentially* on their hands; that a philanthropic and patriarchal Christian State is bound to abolish just so much of slavery as is injurious, and no more, and to retain just so much of it as is beneficial, and no less; and that the Christian patriarch and Christian philanthropist may act together in the accomplishment of this object, by uniting to sustain a "Remedial Code."

The leading point to be kept in view in a Remedial Code is to *preserve the essential quality of slavery*, without the evils which are not of its essence; or, in detail, to provide for the slaves something better than freedom—for the masters something better than slavery—for the free blacks something better than the present condition of their class—and for the conscience and philanthropy of the country a state of self-complacent repose and satisfaction. The Rev. Mr. Nott is "deeply sensible of the difficulties in devising and executing such a code," but he thinks they may be overcome, if the South, "taking the indispensable lead," shall welcome with the whole heart the aid of the North; and he makes his appeal to a Christian country and a Christian people—meaning the people of these United States.

Before stating the distinct provisions of his Remedial Code, the author is careful to repeat the warning that they are devised not in the view of preparing the slaves for freedom, or of substituting any apprenticeship, whether shorter or longer, but on the supposition of a continued and abiding relation. The masters must be masters still, in furnishing employment and requiring labour; the slaves must be slaves still, in rendering labour. Mr. Nott declares the essential elements of slavery to be the slave's "being held to labour," and the master's "being held to maintain labour," and that by this they are advantageously enslaved to each other, such a state being better for each than freedom. He thinks that the relations of labour and provision should be carefully defined, by a benevolent wisdom, the masters being entitled to the use of their capital, and to *some due return for their supervision and direction*, and the slaves entitled to *such avails as labour can permanently secure;* by which ingenious phrase we suppose is meant whatever remains after the master has taken the lion's share.

Now the important question arises, How shall these mutual relations of labour from the slave and provision from the master be secured? As a preliminary to the proper regulation of this matter, Mr. Nott tells us that *the substitution of free for slave labour must be discountenanced, and even disallowed.* "Slave labour must be protected. The masters must not have power to substitute emigrant labour, *to the loss and damage of the slaves*, WHATEVER DIRECT ADVANTAGE MAY TEMPT TO THE INJUSTICE."

Some of our readers may have heard of the passionate and profane wagoner who was followed by a set of vagabonds up a long hill, in anticipation of the volley of oaths which might naturally be expected on his discovery that the whole of his load had escaped, little by little, through a hole in the back of his cart, and how, after making the discovery, and standing for a moment in stupified amazement, he disappointed them by quietly saying, "It's of no use, gentlemen—I give it up—I can't do justice to the occasion."

A similar sense of inadequacy comes over us at the thought of commenting on that last sentence of the Rev. Mr. Nott. Epithets would fail to express its character—analysis would weaken it by expansion—only the forty-parson power which conceived it could fully express its character in another statement.

The enforcement of the master's duty to the slave is settled in ten lines, as follows:

"First, as to the masters. So far as custom long settled and circumstances secure their due care of their slaves, it is well. But *so far as needful*, that care must be secured by new legislation, and must be enforced by the executive powers of the State; and so much the more decidedly as the slaves are less able to secure their own rights. Some officer from among the slaves may be the channel of complaint, and some court of redress may issue the complaint without cost to the slave; *save where his proceeding shall have been merely vexatious and causeless.* The masters, *if needful*, may be compelled to furnish suitable rations and *privileges.*"

If *any* security is needed for the performance of the master's duty to the slave, the above will be quite sufficient, in Mr. Nott's judgment. But to secure the fidelity of people so selfish and unconscientious as the slaves, he finds two pages of stringent provisions necessary, in substance as follows:

Like the man in the old spelling-book, who first threw grass at the boy who was robbing his apple-tree, before trying pebbles, our author recommends that, before the application of enforcement, every pains should be taken to prevent its necessity by securing *voluntary* labour. This, he says, will be partially done by retaining slavery, i. e., by keeping up the habits and expectations of those who, from generation to generation, have been "held to labour." He advises that no formal emancipation should be made, because it would interfere with the above "habits and expectations," and because, "whatever nominal *or real* freedom might result from it, there can be no release to the mass of men from the labour by which they must live." Moreover, he believes it to be an undisputed fact that the slaves of the British West Indies were made *too free*, and emancipated to their own disadvantage. To the force of the continued habits and expectations of slaves he would add, as securities for voluntary labour, these natural provisions: Task-work, giving to the African *contractors* a good margin for their private advantage, and yet *securing to the master* ALL *that is now expected from slave labour;* and, Rewards for faithful and skilful service, or for *contracts* diligently and advantageously fulfilled. Observe, the slave is to work at a master's dictation, will he, nill he; but if he consents to work before the means of compulsion are applied, he is allowed to call the performance of his task the fulfilment of a *contract;* and this contract is to give him a large margin for private advantage, though it gives his master *all* the advantage he *now* gets, without paying or rewarding the slave at all. Truly, Mr. Nott possesses all the ingenuity of the Irish labourer who proposed to dispose of a heap of rubbish by digging a hole to put it in; and who, being asked what he would do with the earth dug out of the hole, replied that he would make the hole large enough for both.

But, Mr. Nott remarks, with an air of pious resignation, "with all the advantage of the habits and expectations of labour preserved, and of a method of tasks and rewards, there must still be supposed a *necessity* of enforcement, and of course there must be allowed a *power* of enforcement," as follows:

1. Privation of the previously supposed rewards.

2. The Scripture rule: If any man will not work, neither shall he eat.

3. Punishment by fines.

4. Solitary confinement and the whip, for the last resort—under decision of some authority above the overseer or master.

5. The power of selling against his will a slave found incurably idle and negligent.

We must next come to the important subject of "Marriage and the domestic relations." And here we find a new principle of action recognised, as follows: "In *this* matter, most surely, evil must not be done that good may come." We will be duly thankful for the recognition of this principle in regard to even one element of the slave's condition.

"In order to the security of the domestic relations, marriage must begin as a civil and religious contract for life, before official persons and witnesses, and with appropriate solemnities; must be considered as sacred and indissoluble as with the white race; and must be dissolved only on the same conditions and with the same formalities. The crimes against marriage also, fornication and adultery, must be under the general laws of the community.

"The family thus established must be sacred; must be protected in its relations of husband and wife, parents and children; and must not *be separated* for less causes, or on harder conditions, than with the white race."

The apparent fanaticism of the former parts of this extract will easily be forgiven by the intelligent slaveholder, in consideration of the power left in his hands by the last clause, to decide when the sufficient causes for separation exist.

The subjects of "Sales and Emigration" come next to be considered, and must be considered, says Mr. Nott, in connection with the requirement that the domestic relations shall be established and sacredly regarded. Other limitations in this department are the following:

1. It is desirable, *if not indispensable*, that sales should not be made without consent, except in the cases of young children and orphans.

2. There seems needful some special provision in behalf of young females, in view of their peculiar exposures; and no sales of such persons should be made without their own consent and that of their friends, *except under due examination and decision.*

3. There may be a provision for the sale of refractory slaves without their consent; which sale *is to be considered* a transportation for misconduct.

"Convey, the wise it call."

In the same chapter we have a second outbreak of apparent fanaticism, in the statement that "buyers must submit to these indispensable changes, for the sake of humanity and justice, at whatever inconvenience." But all is made right again by the considerate suggestion that "it may be hoped that *methods will be found* of supplying every needful service within the scope of humanity and justice."

By the Remedial Code, slaves are to be capable of acquiring and holding property for themselves and their heirs, under the general laws of property, "with whatever *special* rules *and limitations.*"

The master's claim to service is to remain unimpaired and undisturbed; and this, due to the master, for rations and securities, *is to be considered* as *owed* by the slave. Then we have the following specifications:

1. "Without any alteration in existing arrangements, there is yet room for slaves to acquire property." Mr. Nott has remembered to forget this item in the legal definition of a slave, that he "*can acquire nothing, nor possess anything, but what must belong to his owner.*" But he tells us that the slave "may *claim* the *privilege* of labouring on his own account," which is unquestionably true, as also that he may "call spirits from the vasty deep," if he thinks it profitable to spend his time in that way.

2. As capacity and capital increase, the slaves may become *contractors* for any work within their scope.

3. "The redemption of *waste lands* furnishes another obvious mode of acquiring property." That is, when the master has abandoned a piece of ground as utterly useless, exhausted by the slaveholding method of agriculture, he may permit—no—"encourage" the slave, "at some agreed or arbitrated price," to try his hand at reclaiming it. This reminds one of the man who told his wife, "If you have any bread so dry or mouldy as to be absolutely unentable, you may give it to the poor."

4. Slaves may take leases of property, paying rent for their persons and lands, and having a claim for remuneration for all improvements.

Besides several other methods of investment for spare capital, Mr. Nott suggests that the slave may purchase his freedom, "if he choose to sacrifice its price," though, "under the amelioration proposed, freedom will become less and less desirable, and probably less and less desired."

The remaining provisions of the Remedial Code, entitled, respectively,

"Education and Religious Worship,"

"The Protection of the Laws, Judicial Provisions and Methods,"

"Franchises and Freedom," and

"The Methods for the Free,"

are of too great importance to be crowded in at the end of an article, and must be reserved for another week.

KANSAS MEETING AT ALBANY.

A very successful and enthusiastic meeting was held at Albany, on the evening of the 13th inst., to extend "material aid" to Kansas. Nearly five thousand dollars was raised on the spot, of which Gerrit Smith gave three thousand, and Edward C. Delavan one thousand. The balance was made up in sums from twenty-five to one hundred dollars. Measures were taken to appoint a Central Committee for the State, whose duty it shall be to canvass the State for contributions in money to aid the people in Kansas in their personal wants, and against their enemies, as well as to extend help to such persons as may wish to emigrate thither.

There was a good deal of speech-making at the meeting, but the most interesting portion of it seems to have been a debate between Gerrit Smith and Mr. Northup. The latter gentleman is reported to have spoken in a strain of half denunciation of slavery and half eulogy of Millard Fillmore, to which Mr. Smith felt moved to reply. The debate is thus reported in *The Times*:

Mr. Chairman, that speech must not go unanswered [applause]. I must "search out" the gentleman on the instant [applause]—now, while he stands before me, with his strange and wicked logic still fresh in the minds of those who heard him [applause]. Mr. Northup declared himself an Abolitionist.

Mr. Northup—I beg the gentleman's pardon. I made no such declaration.

Mr. Smith—Nevertheless, you made the avowal, as I shall show before I have done with you [applause]. He said he was opposed to the abolition of slavery, until the slaves should have learned to read. This was an absurdity. The slave code says no slave shall be taught to read—not even the holy Bible. If a man is not to be allowed to come out from slavery until he shall have learned to read and to enjoy freedom, then he will never come out of slavery at all. But Mr. Northup, by admitting that slaves should be taught to read, avows himself an Abolitionist, by claiming for the slave a right which slavery denies to all its victims. To admit that slaves have *any* rights is to demand that slavery shall cease [applause], because, while slaves, all rights are denied to them.

Mr. Northup said he would vote for Millard Fillmore, and, at the same moment, demand the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law, of which Millard Fillmore is the author! Millard Fillmore is for dragging back the fugitive into the hell of slavery, while Mr. Northup says *he* will bid the fugitive God-speed! Monstrous inconsistency! Alas, for the kindness which such a vote would extend to the oppressed slave! [Applause.] An indorsement of the Fugitive Slave law, or its author, is an indorsement of that which is more cruel than murder. For would not Mr. Northup rather see his child fall beneath the dagger of the assassin than to see her dragged into slavery?

Mr. Northup, do you believe the mother has a right to her child? Answer, if you please, for I have promised to sift you and search you out [applause]. Do you, Mr. Northup, believe that the mother has a right to her child?

Mr. Northup—I do.

Mr. Smith—Then you are an Abolitionist [applause]; for the moment you admit that a slave has *any* right—even the slave mother the right to her own child—then are you an Abolitionist; for this right—given of God as a right to humanity and as an instinct to the brute—is denied by slavery. Under that accursed institution, not even the mother has the right to her helpless infant. It is the property of her master. And yet you, Mr. Northup, admitting this right, say you are no Abolitionist. But, sir, you *are* an Abolitionist, when you admit this right [applause]. Hence, you are not as bad a man as you believe yourself to be [laughter and applause].

Mr. Northup, do you believe in the right of the slave to the rite of matrimony?

Mr. Northup—Yes.

Mr. Smith—Then, sir, you are an Abolitionist [applause]. For slavery denies the right. The master claims the wife as his property, and denies to the husband the authority which the word of God confers upon him over his wife. If the master says to the wife, "go there," she must go whatever protest may be interposed by the husband. You deny that this is right; and in making this denial, you avow yourself an Abolitionist, and you *are* one, though you may not avow it [applause]. For the moment any man admits that slaves have rights which slavery denies to its victims, that moment he becomes an Abolitionist; for the moment one of these rights is conferred upon a slave, that moment he becomes free; because he could not, at the same moment, enjoy that

and notices were read in most of the churches, except the Presbyterian. The Presbyterian Minister refused to publish the notice. The Methodist Minister, Elder Jacokes, read the notice to his congregation, but afterwards expressed regret that he had done so, when he learned that I was a *Garrisonian!*

My first lecture was attended by a full audience, as many as could be seated, including some of the most influential citizens of the place, and, among the rest, the aforesaid Methodist Minister; who, beside being in ecclesiastical fellowship with the "sum of all villanies," has also, heretofore, been notorious as a voting Democrat, of the Lewis Cass and Franklin Pierce stripe—thus adding a greater number of "horns" and "hoofs" than ever ought to be attached to any one personification of Satan. In this lecture, after speaking of the criminal character of slavery and slaveholding, I reviewed the position of the so-called Democratic Party, and referred, with somewhat of severity, to the said Methodist Minister, as a home illustration of the fact that, thoroughly pro-slavery and diabolical as are the principles of the party, its supporters are found not only as church members in "good and regular standing," but also as occupants of the pulpit! The reference to the minister, who has the reputation of being the best educated, and most talented clergyman of the place, stirred up a good degree of agitation, and at the close of the lecture he was called upon for a reply. He said that he could not *condescend* to reply, denied my charges as false, and resumed his seat. It was quite apparent that his friends were dissatisfied that he should not even undertake to defend his position, as the platform was free, and that most of the audience regarded it as a mere *dodge* on his part.

The next evening the audience was larger than the first, there being more than could be seated, and quite a large number remained standing for nearly two hours. In this lecture I reviewed the position and aims of the Republican party, also presented the doctrine and philosophy of Disunion, and, in conclusion, briefly referred to the Religious aspects of the cause, and to the *excessive* "*dignity*" of the Clerical *De*-mocrat, who failed to vindicate his cause when called upon to do so, the evening previous. I then gave notice that the following evening I would give a lecture upon the relation of the different Religious Denominations to Slavery. The audience, the second evening, as I have before said, was large, intelligent, and manifested a very gratifying degree of interest.

During the following day, the city, or village, authorities (*pious Democrats*) ordered the Marshal to close the Court-House against me. The fact was not communicated to us until a short time before the hour for the lecture to commence. The audience began to assemble in the street, and remained, cold as it was, until some of the citizens, interested in the meetings, and indignant at the course pursued by the authorities, procured the National Hall, the largest in the place, which was soon lighted, though at that late hour it could not well be warmed. In a few moments after the Hall was opened, quite a large audience had assembled therein. Owing to the lateness of the hour, and the coldness of the room, I did not give the lecture I intended to that evening, but spoke for something more than an hour, upon the text furnished by the circumstances attending our meeting—the right of free speech for all on a free platform, &c. We had a good meeting and a very attentive hearing, and I announced, in conclusion, that I would speak the next evening in the same place, on the relation of the churches to slavery. At the close of the meeting, a company of boys threw quantities of corn and beans, and, as we were going from the Hall to our lodgings, followed us, throwing the same, and occasionally an egg, it was said, though none of them hit us. These boys, I was informed by a friend who knew most of them, were the sons of leading *church members*, and were thus defending the Religion of their Fathers! Threats of mobocratic violence were made, if we should attempt to hold a meeting the next evening. During the day, the agent of the Hall, THOMAS DRAKE, Esq., received an anonymous letter, warning him that if he opened the Hall for the lecture that evening, that *not only the Hall but his head would be in danger!* He referred to the fact at the opening of the meeting, and informed the audience that he intended not only to take care of his own head but of the heads of all who came there, and especially of such as came there with mobocratic intentions. Although we had a slight admission-fee to defray expenses, we had a large and an intelligent audience. Except an occasional stick or stone against the windows, from the outside, we had not only no disturbance, but a most excellent and gloriously triumphant meeting. There were occasional hisses as I was illustrating the slave-hunting, slave-breeding characteristics of *American* Christianity, but they were soon lost amid the cheers and applause. It was understood to have been in contemplation to offer violence that evening, as I should go from the Hall to my lodgings, and I presume that for a preservation from the same, I am indebted to a few true hearted and noble women, who, being deeply interested in the cause, and conscious of the state of feeling among the outsiders, resolved that if there was to be any martyrdom on the occasion, they would share a portion of it. The rabble followed us for a short distance, but committed no particular depredations, realizing, I apprehend, that public sentiment was more against them than in their favour. To our friends who so kindly and heartily cooperated with us, we are much indebted—among whom were Mrs. F. W. Gillett, Miss Woolley, Mrs. Farmer, Messrs. Beardsley, Farmer, Gillett, Brotherton, Hipp and others.

After enjoying a few days of rest in the family of CYRUS FULLER, the worthy and efficient President of the Michigan Anti-Slavery Society, and with other kind and valued friends in this vicinity, I am to return to Lenawee County and hold additional meetings during a portion of this month.

Yours, for Universal Liberty, AARON M. POWELL.

Livonia, Wayne Co., Michigan, March 6, 1856.

THE Abolitionists show that Washington, Madison, Jefferson, Pierce, and many other statesmen, North and South, were opposed to African slavery in the abstract, but they do not prove that any of these distinguished men were opposed to forming a union of the States, or desired to abrogate the Constitution upon which our confederacy is based, because slavery had been established in some of the States during past centuries, and is left to the wisdom of those who endure it to deal with us as they may deem fit.

The (Albany) *Evening Journal* quotes the above paragraph from *The* (Boston) *Post*, not, it says, to laugh at the odd association of the name of the gentleman who happens just now to encumber the chair once occupied by Washington, Jefferson and Madison, but to deny, for the thousandth time, the assertion that the Republican party desires to interfere with slavery in the States. "Not a line," exclaims *The Journal* indignantly, "can be found in the speeches or writings of any recognised Republican, justifying the charge. It is one of those stale falsehoods which only dunces and knaves reiterate to give point to these stupid utterances."

If *The Journal* means simply that the Republican party does not intend to interfere with slavery in the States by legislation, then it asserts for that party no more than it might have just as truthfully asserted of the whole body of Abolitionists, with the exception only of a small number who act with Mr. Gerrit Smith. From the inception of the anti-slavery movement, a quarter of a century ago, to the present moment, the doctrine has always been maintained that there is no right and no intention to meddle, by legislation, with the existence of slavery in the several States, not only because the Federal Constitution is recognised as the Law of the Land, but also, because true wisdom dictated that it would be folly to attempt the moral regeneration of a nation by Act of Congress. The Republicans, therefore, have no new platform on this question.

Morality without politics is a very powerful and sufficient lever in a great moral reform, as the progress of the anti-slavery cause has conclusively shown; but politics without morality, we think, will prove to be a reed of another sort. If the Albany *Journal* means that its party repudiates all wish to interfere with slavery in *any* way, whether legislative or otherwise, then it certainly differs very essentially from the Abolitionists proper. It is a pity that its speakers and writers would not be a little more explicit on this point. If it is opposed to the introduction of slavery into the Territories only for certain political and economical reasons; such as that that will give undue preponderance to the Slave Power in the Government, and interfere with the general commercial prosperity; however good such reasons may be, they are certainly very limited in their application both as to time and place. But if, on the other hand, its objection to slavery in the Territories is that the system is a curse everywhere, that it should not be permitted, therefore, to gain fresh foot-hold, then, of course, it follows that the members of the party, if they are either logical or honest, must wish to extirpate everywhere and as speedily as possible, so stupendous a crime which outrages every law of God and every instinct of humanity. By every moral, as distinguished from merely political, means, they must be, of course, anxious to interfere with slavery, and put the speediest possible end to it in all the States. And if they do not do this by legislation, it cannot be because they would not if they could, but because they have not the political power. As politicians merely they should be glad to get and to use, and to use as far as they have already got, the power to exterminate so foul a thing from the face of the earth. Looking at the matter in this light, it seems to us that the Boston paper has got the best of the argument, and that the *Journal* does not fairly represent the spirit of the Republicans, or that, if it does, the sincere Abolitionist need not trouble himself much as to what may become of that party.

CAPTURE OF A SLAVER IN NEW YORK BAY.

IT is very well known that there is a large capital invested in this city in the Foreign Slave Trade, and that a considerable number of slavers are annually fitted out here for the coast of Africa. The names of some of the persons so engaged are notorious, though sufficient legal evidence to convict them of crime could be obtained only with great difficulty, if at all. The present United States District Attorney, Mr. McKeon, has repeatedly attempted it, and has shown as much disposition to bring the law to bear upon these villains as could be expected in a country, and under a Government, where a similar trade, far more terrible to its victims, is not only not illegal, but is highly respectable, and rather an evidence that he who is concerned in it belongs to the most distinguished and most highly privileged class of which the country boasts—is, in fact, the highest title to American aristocracy. And those engaged here in this Foreign Slave Trade by no means lose caste among their fellow-merchants; some of them are men in good social standing, and are held in high consideration on 'Change. Of course they are wealthy, for the profits of the trade are commensurate with its risks, and are immense.

Great care is taken in fitting out their vessels to avoid all evidence that might lead to conviction, though the character of the vessels themselves, and their cargoes may leave no moral doubt whatever as to their destination. Formerly, such vessels went well armed, partly to defend them from cruisers, and partly to overawe the slaves. But they depend now upon speed to elude all pursuers, and, in place of arms to keep the living cargo in subjection, a few casks of sharp carpet tacks are found to answer the purpose quite as effectually. Among the poor naked wretches, packed closely together, a quantity of these are thrown, and the torment and torture to every moving body is found quite sufficient to subdue any insubordination among them. A Custom-House clearance also used to be one of the difficulties these traders had to encounter, for Manifests and shipping papers were difficult things to manage without exciting suspicion. This they endeavour latterly to avoid, by leaving port without asking permission of the Collector, trusting to a dark night and a good pair of heels. One of them tried this game on Monday night last, but was luckily tripped up.

Information was given, it seems, on Sunday, to the District Attorney, that a suspicious-looking vessel was lying at the foot of Fourteenth street, fitting out, apparently, for the Slave Trade, and orders were given to two officers to watch and seize her, if that should prove to be the case. On Monday she was hauled into the stream, and allowed to drift up with the tide as far as Astoria, where she anchored. Here she was joined by another schooner, and stores taken on board. On Monday evening it was evident that preparations were making to put to sea. The officers on the watch then received authority from Mr. McKeon to seize her, and sent to the Navy Yard for a file of marines to aid them. The rest of the story may be told in the *Herald's* report:

Thus instructed, the Marshals hired the steamtug Only Son, and, with twelve marines, under command of Captain Watson, went down the bay to head off the Falmouth. All this was done after midnight.

Meanwhile, the mysterious schooner dropped slowly down the river, until she came to Sixty-first street, where over fifty hogsheads of water were taken on board, when she continued her voyage, aided by the steamtug Ajax.

Morning had broke before the Falmouth reached the Narrows, and in another hour she would have been out of all danger of capture, but fate had decreed otherwise. The Only Son ran alongside the vessel, and, before the astonished crew knew what they were about, twelve marines precipitated themselves on the deck. Three of the men rushed for the cabin, apparently with a view to destroy some papers that might lead to detection, but the officers were too quick for them, and sprang to the doorway, telling no one to enter under peril of their lives.

The steamtug Ajax would not come to when ordered, and one of the marines seized an axe and cut the hawser that bound her to the Falmouth, when she steamed up and made way for the city with all possible speed, without an inquiry from on board as to the cause of the stoppage. The schooner was then towed up to the Navy Yard, where she was placed under charge of Lieutenant Decatur.

Yesterday, at noon, District-Attorney McKeon and his Deputy, Mr. Joachimssen, visited the captured vessel for the purpose of inspecting her and the crew, twelve in number, all of whom were placed in arrest.

They found the Falmouth to be a "long, low, black" craft of about 250 tons burthen, with raking masts, and altogether a very piratical looking concern in appearance, whatever she may be in reality.

On her stern is painted the words "Falmouth, Baltimore," and the American eagle adorns her prow. The vessel was open under deck from the cabin to stem, and boards were found to erect, it is supposed, a slave deck, that would hold, as one of the officers remarked, "about 600 niggers." The search of the vessel revealed many curious circumstances. On deck was found a large medicine chest, with castor oil, lint and drugs, evidently intended for a larger company than those on board ship, in which there were only thirteen persons. Between decks were over fifty hhds. of water, large stores of rice, beans, farina and preserved meats, such as are used by slavers. Large copper pots and pans for boiling large masses of food at a time, with ladles and spoons to match, and many other questionable appurtenances. About the deck was a number of extra spars. In the cabin were found charts of the west coast of Africa, and a large quantity of bunting to make American flags.

But if these circumstances spoke for themselves the crew on board were not so communicative, but were as silent and as non-committal as the members of the Know-Nothing fraternity are said to be. None of them knew how they had got aboard—who had shipped them—where they were going to—what the captain or owners' names were. All on board the vessel were Portuguese, and either did not or pretended not to understand a word of English. The captain was a myth. No one on board acknowledged the title, or could tell who that functionary was. Three of the men said they were passengers, but could not tell who they paid their money to, or where the ship was going, though one of them, who was suspected of being captain, betrayed an accurate knowledge of St. Paul de Loando and Angola, both noted resorts for slavers.

"Well, gentlemen," said Mr. McKeon, addressing Marshals De Angelos and Nevins, "you have a fine prize here. According to the law those who seize a slaver, or a vessel without an owner, are entitled to half the vessel and cargo. This schooner appears to have no owner."

"Let us try if that is so," responded one of the officers.

Accordingly, every man on board the vessel were called up, but all in turn denied owning the suspected property, and the most rigid cross-examination failed to elicit any light on the subject. The following named persons were placed under arrest, and ordered to be taken to Kings County Jail, there to await the further action of the District-Attorney:

Passengers—José Lopez, Casper Marrech, Joseph Antoine. Seamen—Manuel Fortunato, Antoine Gomez, Juan Grazzia, Albert Rose, Antoine José, Manuel Gomez, Emmanuel José, Emmanuel Robert, José Azardo.

A number of circumstances, which it would be improper to mention here, throw considerable suspicion on the Portuguese Consul, Señor C. H. S. De la Figaniere. It seems he was in communication with several persons on board, and knew of their whereabouts. The affair, however, is to be further investigated. The vessel now lies at the Navy Yard, under the charge of the Deputy Marshal.

AMERICAN SNOBBERY ABROAD.—Paris letters to the daily press, received by the last steamer, give glowing accounts of a splendid ball which was given by the Americans in that capital on the 22d ult. At the head of the committee is the name of the American Minister, Mr. Mason, a specimen of whose peculiarly republican humour we gave in the last STANDARD. Under the auspices of such a leader, who carries the manners of the plantation into the salons of the Tuilleries, the American society in Paris must be exceedingly elegant and attractive, and accordingly no one can be surprised at an evidence of its good taste and good-breeding given by the committee of this ball. Of course it raked all Paris for all the Lord Tomnoddies and Lady Flapdoddles that could be found, and sent cards of invitations, in bad French, to anybody who had a prefix to his name, or was supposed to be entitled to wear a bit of ribbon at his button-hole, for, for that sort of snobbery, our amiable countrymen abroad, as a class, have long been distinguished. It is stated, however, that Charles Dickens would have been glad to be present, but a ticket was denied him by the committee. Whether Mr. Dickens had any such wish, we think very doubtful, and that the committee declined to invite him is very much to his credit. Mr. Mason and his associates, it is said, could not forget that he was the author of "The American Notes." That he should have laughed at our dexterity in spitting, in chair-balancing, and other peculiar national accomplishments, might have been overlooked, perhaps; but as he had spoken disrespectfully of our great Institution, he was not to be forgiven. So the Virginia slavebreeder declines Mr. Dickens's acquaintance.

It is to be hoped he will not take it much to heart, but will comfort himself with the reflection that some hundreds of thousands of people, in this country, are, this very week, reading several pirated editions of the fourth No. of "Little Dorrit."

CONGRESS.

THE Kansas question is still under discussion, in one shape or another, in both Houses of Congress, but it seems with little spirit. In the House, the question is the right of Whitfield to his seat, and days have been consumed in speeches, and several more, perhaps, will be before a vote is taken on sending for persons and papers, for which the Republicans are contending. It is very doubtful if they carry their point.

In the Senate, on Saturday, the tedium of the dry season was somewhat enlivened by a short "heated term," in which a spicy debate ensued between the two Illinois Senators, assisted by two or three others. We copy the report of it as made by Telegraph. The question was on printing the reports on Kansas affairs, a long majority report from the Committee having been submitted by Mr. Douglas, and a minority report by Mr. Callamer.

Mr. JOHNSON reported in favour of printing 31,000 copies of the majority and minority reports of the Territorial Committee on Kansas affairs—being 500 copies for each member.

Mr. TRUMBULL opposed the motion. He thought the minority report presented the slavery question in a masterly manner—its positions being unanswerable—but it was not written as a reply to the details of the majority report, and he was unwilling to send out, with the indorsement of the Senate, a document containing so many unwarrantable assumptions, erroneous deductions and inconsistencies.

Mr. WADE asked Mr. Trumbull to yield the floor for adjournment.

Mr. DOUGLAS—I hope not; the courtesies of the Senate have been taken advantage of on account of my known absence to make an assault on me.

Mr. TRUMBULL—No, sir; I knew not whether you were present or absent when I was commenting on the report. I did not introduce the subject, nor did I know it would come up to-day.

Mr. DOUGLAS—My colleague dares to say, in face of the fact, that he did not know I was absent. He acted with unfairness in attacking the report when I was detained from the Senate by ill health. I would ask him within what reasonable time his speech will be printed?

Mr. TURNBULL—I think it will be published by Monday.

Mr. DOUGLAS—If I can ask a postponement of the question till Monday, I will reply to Mr. Trumbull's speech on Tuesday.

Mr. SEWARD—Take your own time.

Mr. DOUGLAS—(Quickly)—I understand that game; "take your own time." The Senator from Massachusetts took his own time to write and circulate a libel on me when the Nebraska bill was reported. I understood my colleague to say he came here as a Democrat. That will be news to the Democracy of Illinois, and is a libel on the Democracy of that State.

Mr. CRITTENDEN interposed, saying the debate had transcended the rules of decorum. The Senator had charged a libel on Mr. Trumbull (sensation).

Mr. DOUGLAS—I should have been better satisfied if the Senator from Kentucky had, when Black Republicans denounced us in coarse terms, rebuked them for want of courtesy.

Mr. CRITTENDEN—To what do you allude?

Mr. DOUGLAS—When they made coarse and vulgar partisan assaults on the Democratic side of the Senate.

Mr. CRITTENDEN—It was no more my business than that of others to call Senators to order for personalities. This is not the place for vituperation. Such matters should be settled elsewhere.

Mr. DOUGLAS—I do not regard the Senator as good authority in Illinois politics. I was speaking of events of which I am better capable of judging than he.

After further colloquy, the Chair decided that Mr. Douglas's remark was not personal.

Mr. DOUGLAS—So far as I am advised, and as I believe, my colleague was the candidate of a miserable sect of Abolitionists and Know-Nothings—which are one and the same thing.

Mr. CRITTENDEN—I wish the Senator to understand that I cooperate with the American party, and, standing here as a gentleman and a Senator, and claiming all the respect due to my honesty as a freeman, I repel with scorn every imputation of that kind, as intended to embrace me and my political associates.

Mr. DOUGLAS explained—I spoke of what Know-Nothingism is in Illinois, and said it might be otherwise in the South. Every Know-Nothing Lodge in Illinois has adopted an Abolition creed; and that is the miserable faction which sent my colleague here. The Senator from Kentucky misunderstood me, else he would not have conceived my remark as personal to him.

Mr. CRITTENDEN—The gentleman did not make the qualification he now does.

Mr. DOUGLAS—Every gentleman must have understood me as making a distinction. I said nothing about Southern Know-Nothings.

Mr. TRUMBULL—I shall not permit such remarks as these, from my colleague, to pass unanswered. I shall suffer no man, here or elsewhere, to state of me things which are absolutely and totally unfounded. If he means to say I am, or ever have been, a Know-Nothing, or connected with any secret political organization, the charge is basely——I will not violate the rules of the Senate, but say—untrue. He proceeded to speak of the politics of Illinois, saying she was and had always been a Democratic State. In the Eighth Congressional District, which gave Pierce nearly 5,000 majority, he (Trumbull) was elected a member of the House by more than 2,600 majority. He ran as the Anti-Nebraska candidate. How did his colleague know he received every Know-Nothing and Abolition vote? He (Mr. Trumbull) did not know it.

Mr. DOUGLAS—My colleague said the reason why he did not accept, at Salem, my proposition to resign our seats last year, to test, by reelection, whether he or I represented Illinois, was that Governor Mattison would appoint me and another Democrat to fill the vacancies. I tell him I will sign a resignation now to take effect at the next meeting of the Legislature.

Mr. BROWN—That's right.

Mr. DOUGLAS—I'll give him till Monday morning to think of it.

Mr. WELLER—That's better.

Mr. DOUGLAS—I said my colleague received every Abolition and Know-Nothing vote in the Legislature. He dare not deny that statement. Why equivocate?

In further remarks Mr. Douglas said that his colleague had become a Chief of the Black Republicans.

Mr. TRUMBULL—I ask my colleague to explain.

Mr. DOUGLAS—Was not the gentleman voted for by Abolitionists and Know-Nothings from all parts of the State?

Mr. TRUMBULL—I tell him no to his teeth. I never was a candidate of the Abolitionist or Know-Nothing party. I have been voted for by members of the American party, and it was so with the gentleman; but that I was their candidate is not true.

The colloquy was continued further, when Mr. SUMNER replied to the remark of Mr. Douglas, that he (Sumner) had obtained a week's delay of the Nebraska bill in order to circulate a libel on him (Douglas). Mr. Sumner said that it was untrue—that he had united with other members of the Senate in sending an address to the people of the United States, expressing the true character of the bill, and predicting many of the evils which have since ensued.

Mr. DOUGLAS said that both Messrs. Chase and Sumner, on the occasion referred to, came to his seat and asked him to postpone the Nebraska bill one week, in order to give them time to examine it. He did so; but the day after, he discovered they had written an exposition of that measure and scattered it broadcast. It was the false statement, that they had not had time to examine the bill, of which he (Douglas) complained. That address attributed to him a base purpose, self-aggrandizement, and not a proper sense of public duty. The Senator from Massachusetts did not consider that libellous—oh, no! This might accord with his ideas of a gentleman and a Senator.

Mr. SUMNER—I shall enter into no contest here or elsewhere as to the character of a gentleman. This Senate shall decide whether the Senator from Illinois is the proper judge of this matter. It is not true that I went to the Senator's seat to make the request to which he alludes.

Mr. DOUGLAS repeated that Mr. Sumner, while pretending he wanted time to read the Nebraska bill, had previously franked a grossly libellous pamphlet on the subject.

Mr. SUMNER said the address was predicated on the first bill and not on the last.

Mr. DOUGLAS remarked that the reasons assigned by Mr. Sumner for the postponement of the Nebraska bill were not true in fact.

Mr. Johnson's motion was then adopted, and the Senate adjourned to Monday.

HARDSHIPS OF A FOREIGN EMBASSY.—The London correspondent of the New York *Journal of Commerce* is exercised in his mind as to a possible misfortune which may await Mr. Dallas, our new minister to the Court of St. James, on some future occasion when he shall dine with the Queen, or partake of a diplomatic dinner with a minister, or feed with the Lord Mayor. His Imperial Majesty of Hayti, it seems, forgetful that the United States Government might not approve of it, has the temerity to send an Ambassador to England, and one, too, who had the impertinence to be born black. This man, whom we should call in this country a "saucy nigger," whom His Excellency, Mr. Mason, would compute to be worth a thousand dollars in Richmond, is known among other people—who are not Americans and Republicans—as Baron Cuvier, is a member, of course, of the *corps diplomatique*, and is received at the Court of the Queen with as much decorum and distinction as if he were as white as Victoria herself. "Last week," exclaims the horror-struck correspondent of our pious contemporary, "he was at the Queen's levee." He was also "very prominent at the opening of Parliament," and, what makes it the more aggravating is, that he always appears in a most brilliant uniform, while Mr. Buchanan's clothes are of the colour of the Haytian's skins. And now, says the correspondent, in a grand rage, "Let us fancy one of our ministers dining with the Queen, or at a diplomatic dinner given by a minister, or the Lord Mayor, and this negro at his right! What would be the feelings of our countryman—and worse what his recourse for the pain inflicted upon them?" "Phancy his feelinks," indeed! Words fail to portray them.

AN ABOLITIONIST PAPER IN KENTUCKY.

NEWPORT, KY., March 10, 1856.

MESSRS. EDITORS: I've been travelling in the manchattel States for several months past, kindling and relighting the flame of hope in the breasts of the hopeless blacks, and endeavouring, as far as possible, to aid the sacred cause of Abolition among the whites, by politico-economical arguments in favour of Free Labour and Free Soil. Not by the argument of a Higher Law—ah! no! Slavery has deadened the moral sense of this people too effectually, to render appeals to their humane or religious instincts effective. To reach their humanity, you must go through their purse. Their hearts are guarded by Dollars.

There is a paper published here which I wish to commend to the attention of your readers. I refer to the *Newport* (Ky.) *News*. It is a daily paper, anti-slavery "up to the hub, hub and all"—as uncompromising in its opposition to the "domestic" iniquity of the South; as fearless in its denunciations and expositions of the moral and pecuniary effects of the "peculiar" and "patriarchal" crime as *The Liberator* or the *Anti-Slavery Standard*. Mr. Bailey has sacrificed a great deal to keep up this journal. He is personally as well as morally a brave man; if he were timid, in either respect, his press would long ago have been immersed in the Ohio river. His whole family deprive themselves of the comforts of life, which are within their immediate reach, to sustain the cause of freedom of speech and advance anti-slavery sentiment in Kentucky. His son, two grown daughters and a young child-daughter, as well as Mr. Bailey himself, devote their whole time to the paper—editing, setting up type, and printing. By crossing the river into free Ohio they could live in comparative affluence, but they prefer to serve freedom, even with poverty, by living in Kentucky.

Newport has few slaveholders, but many pro-slavery men. In fact, it is the most ultra pro-slavery town in Kentucky. Here, as elsewhere, the meaner the white man the intenser is his hatred of the slave. Slaveholders, as a general thing, are more favourably inclined to Emancipation than the "poor whites of the South."

Bailey is doing a great deal of good here. They dare not throw his press into the river, because they are afraid of him; Abolition, therefore, can get an audience at this point.

Can't you do something to put the *News* on a firm pecuniary basis?

Let those who wish to read a Southern paper with a backbone, subscribe for the *News*. It costs only $2 per year. Yours ever, JOHN BALL, JR.

☞ *Liberator* and *Bugle* please notice.

FUGITIVE SLAVE CASE IN CALIFORNIA.—The Los Angelos *Star* reports the trial of a recent slave case in that place before one Judge Hayes. It was not to be expected that in that remote and benighted region much good law was to be found, or that Judges should always keep pace with the judicial wisdom of this side of the Continent. One would think from reading the report of this case Judge Kane had never been heard of at Los Angelos; or if he has, it is evident that Judge Hayes is either one of those obstinately conservative men, who does not easily accept new doctrines, or one who permits himself to be governed by simple principles of Justice without regard to judicial precedents. If his decision in the case before us be correct, then Judge Kane in his opinion in the Williamson case made a monstrous innovation. Certainly, he or Grier, or any other Slave-Commissioner in the Atlantic States, that we know anything about, would have come to a very different conclusion than that reached by Judge Hayes. Any State law that would have stood in their way would have been at once pronounced unconstitutional. But all that can be said for California is that she is still a young State. The case is thus reported:

In this case, the benefit of the writ of habeas corpus is brought for fourteen persons of colour, namely—Hannah, aged 34; and Biddy, 38, and their children, to wit: Ann, 17; Lawrence, 12; Nathaniel, 10; Jane, 8; Charles, 6; Marion, 4; Martha, 2; an infant boy two weeks, all children of Hannah; Mary, 2 years, child of said Ann; Ellen, 17; Ann, 12; Harriet, 8, children of Biddy. The petition states that they are free, having been brought into the State of California in the year 1851 (in the fall, it seems) by Robert Smith, who has resided here with them ever since, and now holds them in servitude, and is about to remove to the State of Texas, carrying them with him into slavery. The defendant's return to the writ alleges that in Mississippi he owned, as slaves, Hannah, Ann, Lawrence and Nathaniel, and Biddy and her three children above named; he left that State for Utah Territory; Jane was born in Missouri (Illinois?), Charles in Utah Territory, and the other four in California; they left Mississippi with their own consent rather than remain there, and he has supported them ever since, subjecting them to no greater control than his own children, and not holding them as slaves; it is his intention to remove to Texas and take them with him; Hannah and her children are well disposed to remain with him, and the petition was filed without their knowledge and consent. "It is understood," he adds, "between said Smith and said persons that they will return to said State of Texas with him, voluntarily, as a portion of his family."

All were brought up by warrant, except Hannah, who was shown to be sick, Lawrence, engaged in waiting on her, and Charles, absent in San Barnardino County, not within this judicial district. The case was submitted as if all were present, under the statute, and judgment rendered on the return, in substance, that all said persons are free; and, for their greater safety, those under twenty-one years of age were placed in the custody of the Sheriff of this County, as their special guardian, except Charles, who was, by a warrant, placed in like manner in charge of the Sheriff of San Bernardino County; other orders being made to secure this temporary disposition from any unauthorized interference. The two mothers were also finally put under charge of the Sheriff of this County for their protection. The reasons for this decision were given fully, with which it is just to him to add, the defendant seemed to be content.

SOUTHERN EMIGRATION TO KANSAS.—The outcry which the South has been making in regard to the Northern Kansas Aid Societies would seem to have been much on the principle that a flying pickpocket cries "Stop thief!" The Northern Societies are designed solely to help such persons as may wish to become *bona fide* settlers in the Territory, and no other condition is required, and no pledge even exacted that they desire to make it a Free State. At the South, on the contrary, where the complaint has been long and loud against the Northern Societies, they are now forming Societies of their own with the express and avowed purpose of making Kansas a slave State. This is Southern faith, which, like Punic faith, is become the synonym for falsehood and deceit.

Every mail brings intelligence of some new movement somewhere at the South to raise means and men to send to Kansas, there to become, not settlers, but merely voters, and, if need be, fighters. A correspondent of *The Tribune*, writing from Tennessee, gives an account of this sort of emigration. There is not, he says, a train of cars that passes between Nashville and Augusta, Georgia, that does not have quite a number of men outward bound for Kansas; and they are forming companies all through South Carolina, Georgia and Tennessee. These men are all armed to the teeth, and are passed free on all the railroads. One company recently went through Nashville from Charleston, S. C., free of charge, each man carrying, in addition to his rifle, revolver and bowie-knife, the following certificate:

"CERTIFICATE.

"CHARLESTON, S. C., ——, 1856.

"TO ALL THE TRUE FRIENDS OF THE RIGHTS OF THE SOUTH.

"WE HEREBY CERTIFY, that Mr. ——, the bearer of this, is a *true Southern man in sentiment*, and emigrates to Kansas with a bona fide purpose of becoming an inhabitant thereof, and of aiding the constituted authorities in maintaining the Government and Laws now in force in said Territory, *or such other laws as may be passed for the preservation of Slave Institutions*, and we earnestly commend him to the kind offices and friendly services of all who are in favour of maintaining the rights of the South.

WILLIAM WHALEY,	JOHN CUNNINGHAM,
S. G. TUPPER,	WM. H TRESCATT,
WM. D. PORTER,	A. W. BURNET,
J. W. EASON,	W. E. MARTIN,
THEO. G. BARKER,	WM. LEBBY,
W. R. TABB,	F. D. RICHARDSON,
	A. F. BROWNING,

"Executive Committee of the Society for the aid of the Slave Settlement of Kansas. Attested by me,

"THEODORE G. BARKER, Sec'y."

The writer adds that these men have no fixed purpose in going to Kansas except to aid in making it a slave State. He conversed with many of them, and they declared their intention of returning to their homes as soon as the question was settled.

THEODORE PARKER'S FAST-DAY SERMON.—We learn that the Rev. Theodore Parker will improve the occasion of the Annual Fast in Massachusetts, which occurs on the 3d of April, to give a "skrede of doctrine" at Music Hall, Boston, on the question of Slavery. His text will be, "The Interest which the Northern Men have in Keeping Slavery out of Kansas and Nebraska." It is not to be doubted that it will be a sermon worth hearing; and those who may not have the opportunity of listening to it, we hope may be permitted to read it. We may venture to say before hand that it ought to be published.

THE GOVERNOR OF KENTUCKY'S ANSWER.—The *Cincinnati Gazette* of the 17th inst. says, that a note from Governor Morehead, of Kentucky, has been seen by the editor of that paper, addressed to the agent sent by Gov. Chase to demand the rendition of Margaret, accused of murdering her child. The Kentucky Governor expresses his extreme regret and indignation, the *Gazette* says, at the course taken by Gaines, the master, who had removed Margaret to another State, but promises that she shall be returned, and that measures have already been taken for that purpose. We are by no means persuaded, nevertheless, of the sincerity of Governor Morehead's regret. To decline absolutely the requisition of the Governor of another State for a criminal, would be a serious thing to do, and it would be no less serious to return to Ohio a fugitive slave. To have the criminal beyond the reach of the requisition is an easy solution of the difficulty, and to express regret that the law could not be complied with are mere words of course. The return of Margaret is a new evidence that Slave-Law is the paramount law of the land, North as well as South, and it is by the quiet but repeated assertion of that principle that the South has most to gain. We shall believe, more than we now do, that there is any regard for any other law in the Southern States when we hear that Gov. Morehead or the Governor of some other Southern State has returned Margaret to Ohio.

REWARD OF MERIT.—Rust, the Mississippi member of Congress who recently made a brutal and cowardly attack upon Horace Greeley at Washington, has received, or is to receive, a gold medal from his constituents as a token of their appreciation of his merit in discharging so faithfully that part of his duty as a representative of the South. We are not disposed to question the award, as we are not acquainted with the precise scale by which it is rendered. But if merely thrashing a Northern editor, who readers himself obnoxious to the overseers, is worthy of a gold medal, what will be given to one who assaults a M. C. who indulges in any freedom of speech? What to one who proves himself worthy of a still higher reward by killing some pestilent Northern fellow who ventures to doubt the divinity of slavery? Hitherto rewards for such, and such like services, to the South have been large but rather indirect, both to Southern ruffianism and Northern servility. It is certainly an improvement on the old system, to give the *quid pro quo* on the spot, and for value received. Mr. Greeley seems born to distinction. Many other men beside he have worn white coats, but his white coat alone has become celebrated. So many men beside he have been thrashed; but it was reserved for him to be thought so worthy of a thrashing, that a medal of gold could only properly recompense the deed.

DEATH OF ANOTHER OF "MARGARET'S" CHILDREN.—A correspondent of the *Louisville Courier* gives an account of a collision of two steamboats on the Ohio, in which a number of lives were lost, and among them the infant child of Margaret, the slave mother who was recently returned to slavery by Commissioner Pendery, of Cincinnati. Four of the slaves of Gaines, says the letter, were on the boat, on their way to Arkansas, the master having, it seems, pronounced and executed the sentence so much dreaded by Northern slaves of "Down the river." To ensure against their escape, and perhaps to settle for the Governor of Kentucky the question of answering the requisition of the Governor of Ohio, the slaves probably were sent to the South-west for sale. At the time of the accident alluded to, three of them were saved, but the fourth, Margaret's infant, was drowned. The mother, adds the writer, "exhibited no other feeling than joy at the loss of her child." So closes another act of this terrible tragedy.

Margaret, it seems, too, had been torn from her other children, as the letter says she was accompanied by the two Simons, father and son. From them also, probably, she will soon be parted by sale.

UNITED STATES SENATORS ELECTED IN KANSAS.—A despatch to the daily press says that the Kansas correspondent of the *St. Louis Democrat* writes to that paper that the Free State Legislature, now in session at Topeka, have elected Gov. Reeder U. S. Senator for six years, and Gen. Lane for three years.

PENNSYLVANIA FAIR.—We are requested to state that in the Report of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Fair the generous contributions from friends in ABINGTON were, by mistake, left unacknowledged.

ANTI-SLAVERY TRACTS.

THE Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society have issued the following Tracts for gratuitous distribution:

No. 1. THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, EXAMINED.
No. 2. WHITE SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES.
No. 3. COLONIZATION. By Rev. O. B. Frothingham.
No. 4. DOES SLAVERY CHRISTIANIZE THE NEGRO? By Rev. T. W. Higginson.
No. 5. THE INTER-STATE SLAVE TRADE. By John G. Palfrey.
No. 6. THE "RUIN" OF JAMAICA. By Richard Hildreth.
No. 7. REVOLUTION THE ONLY REMEDY FOR SLAVERY.
No. 8. TO MOTHERS IN THE FREE STATES. By MRS. E. L. Follen.
No. 9. INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY UPON THE WHITE POPULATION. By a Lady.
No. 10. SLAVERY AND THE NORTH. By C. C. Burleigh.
No. 11. DISUNION OUR WISDOM AND OUR DUTY. By Rev. Charles E. Hodges.
No. 12. ANTI-SLAVERY HYMNS AND SONGS. By MRS. E. L. Follen.
No. 13. THE TWO ALTARS; OR, TWO PICTURES IN ONE. By Mrs. Harriet B. Stowe.
No. 14. "HOW CAN I HELP TO ABOLISH SLAVERY?" OR, COUNSELS TO THE NEWLY CONVERTED. By Maria W. Chapman.
No. 15. WHAT HAVE WE, AS INDIVIDUALS, TO DO WITH SLAVERY? By Susan C. Cabot.
No. 16. THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY; AND ITS POLICY OF SUPPRESSION AND SILENCE. Being the Unanimous Remonstrance of the Fourth Congregational Society, Hartford, Ct.
No. 17. THE GOD OF THE BIBLE AGAINST SLAVERY. By Rev. Charles Beecher.

All donations for the Tract Fund, or for the circulation of any particular Tract of the above series, should be sent to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer of the American Anti-Slavery Society, 21 Cornhill, Boston.

Fifty dollars will stereotype an eight-page tract, and print *five thousand copies of it.*

Application for the above Tracts, for gratuitous distribution, should be made to SAMUEL MAY, J

Miscellaneous Department.

HEINRICH HEINE'S SONNETS TO HIS MOTHER.

TO MY MOTHER, B. HEINE, FORMERLY VON GELDERN.

I.

It is my wont to bear my head full high—
Nor can my mind boast much of pliant grace;
If even the king should look me in the face,
I should not wear a downward look—not I!
And yet, dear mother, I will not deny,
However my proud soul thus guards its place,
If I but feel thy blessed soft embrace,
I stand before thee timorous and shy.
Is it thy spirit that sublimes me so—
That lofty spirit, which can pierce through all,
And take its shining way in Heaven's full glow?
Bitter is memory, as I recal
So many deeds which thy dear heart hath riven—
That tender heart which so much love has given!

II.

Once in mad mood I left thee, to begin
A quest through all the world from land to land—
For I would see what love I could command,
Dreaming that love some other love must win.
No path there was but I sought love therein;
At every door I took my suppliant stand,
And begged small alms of love with outstretched hand,
But only for my pains met Spite's cold grin.
And ever still for love I wandered—ever,
For love, and yet love found I never,
And so came home again all sick and sad.
But when to welcome me thou didst arise,
O what was that which swam in thy clear eyes?
The dear and long-sought love; and I was glad.

—*Translated for The Manchester (England) Times.*

ROGERS'S TABLE TALK.

From The London Leader.

HAD the writer on *Table Talk* in the last Quarterly waited a few weeks, he might have added to his list one of the pleasantest of the anecdotical works that subject embraces. Samuel Rogers was not a brilliant talker, but his long life, and the amazing wealth of his acquaintance—including princes and poets, actors and artists, warriors and statesmen, wits and leaders of fashion—furnished his conversation with more anecdotes than perhaps any other man of his time could pretend to. The present volume is just what might have been expected; rich in anecdote, and personal glimpses, but by no means remarkable either for wit or wisdom in the passages which Rogers himself furnishes. The editor has discharged his office with unusual skill. He might, indeed, have spared us several feeble entries, but we have reason to be grateful that he has not been more liberal in this respect. He has printed nothing which can affect the living, much that must interest every one; and he has so arranged the scattered fragments under their several heads that details which in themselves would be too trivial for record, become important as cumulative traits from which to form a picture. In one word, the book is charming, and will furnish "Table Talk" for all England.

Our task will be to enrich our columns with choice morsels. We begin with an exquisite compliment paid by Burke to Reynolds when the painter gave his farewell lecture:

"Sir Joshua concluded the lecture by saying, with great emotion, 'And I should desire that the last words which I should pronounce in this Academy and from this place might be the name of—Michael Angelo.' As he descended from the rostrum, Burke went up to him, took his hand, and said,

"'The angel ended, and in Adam's ear
So charming left his voice, that he awhile
Thought him still speaking, still stood fix'd to hear.'"

The following is not new, but is good enough to bear repetition:

"Doctor Fordyce sometimes drank a good deal at dinner. He was summoned one evening to see a lady patient, when he was more than half-seas over, and conscious that he was so. Feeling her pulse, and finding himself unable to count its beats, he muttered, 'Drunk, by God!' Next morning, recollecting the circumstance, he was greatly vexed: and just as he was thinking what explanation of his behaviour he should offer to the lady, a letter from her was put into his hand. 'She too well knew,' said the letter, 'that he had discovered the unfortunate condition in which she was when he last visited her; and she entreated him to keep the matter secret in consideration of the enclosed (a hundred-pound banknote).'"

This on Voltaire is creditable to Adam Smith:

"When a young man, I went to Edinburgh, carrying letters of introduction (from Dr. Kippis, Dr. Price, &c.) to Adam Smith, Robertson, and others. When I first saw Smith, he was at breakfast, eating strawberries; and he descanted on the superior flavour of those grown in Scotland. I found him very kind and communicative. He was (what Robertson was not) a man who had seen a great deal of the world. Once, in the course of conversation, I happened to remark of some writer that 'he was rather superficial—*a* Voltaire.' 'Sir,' cried Smith, striking the table with his hand, 'there has been but *one* Voltaire!'"

Of Erskine we have some delightful *mots:*

"When Lord Erskine heard that somebody had died worth two hundred thousand pounds, he observed, 'Well, that's a very pretty sum to begin the next world with.'

"'A friend of mine,' said Erskine, 'was suffering from a continual wakefulness; and various methods were tried to send him to sleep, but in vain. At last his physicians resorted to an experiment which succeeded perfectly: they dressed him in a watchman's coat, put a lantern into his hand, placed him in a sentry-box, and—he was asleep in ten minutes.'

"To all letters soliciting his 'subscription' to anything, Erskine had a regular form of reply, viz., 'Sir, I feel much honoured by your application to me, and I beg to subscribe'—here the reader had to turn over the leaf—'myself your very obedient servant,' &c."

This reminds us of the splendid hoax played by Lokkowitz, the Austrian minister, who detested the Jesuits, and in his will made them a bequest which must have made their mouths water with expectation. After a devout preamble, he bequeathed to the society 82,000—here the leaf had to be turned over, and on the other side were the words—"nails towards a new building." The following, especially the first and last, are admirable:

"Erskine used to say that when the hour came that all secrets should be revealed, we should know the reason why—shoes are always made too tight.

"When he had a house at Hampstead, he entertained the very best company. I have dined there with the Prince of Wales—the only time I ever had any conversation with his royal highness. On that occasion the Prince was very agreeable and familiar. Among other anecdotes which he told us of Lord Thurlow, I remember these two. The first was: Thurlow once said to the Prince, 'Sir, your father will continue to be a popular king as long as he continues to go to church every Sunday, and to be faithful to that ugly woman, your mother; but you, sir, will never be popular.' The other was this: While his servants were carrying Thurlow up-stairs to his bed-room, just before his death, they happened to let his legs strike against the banisters, upon which he uttered *the last words he ever spoke*—a frightful imprecation on 'all their souls.'

"Erskine said that the Prince of Wales was quite 'a cosmogony man' (alluding to *The Vicar of Wakefield*), for he had only two classical quotations—one from Homer and one from Virgil, which he never failed to sport when there was any opportunity of introducing them.

"Latterly Erskine was very poor; and no wonder, for he always contrived to sell out of the funds when they were very low, and to buy in when they were very high. 'By heaven,' he would say, 'I am a perfect kite, all paper; the boys might fly me.' Yet, poor as he was, he still kept the best society: I have met him at the Duke of York's, &c. &c."

The following epigram may not have been printed before, but it circulates among the Erskine stories:

"The French have taste in all they do,
Which we are quite without;
For Nature, that to them gave *goût*,
To us gave only gout."

Many are the stories respecting the power of man's eye on wild animals; but we believe the effect is attributed to a wrong cause; here are two:

"Thomas Grenville told me this curious fact. When he was a young man, he one day dined with Lord Spencer at Wimbledon. Among the company was George Pitt (afterwards Lord Rivers), who declared that he could tame the most furious animal by looking at it steadily. Lord Spencer said, 'Well, there is a mastiff in the court-yard here, which is the terror of the neighbourhood: will you try your powers on him?' Pitt agreed to do so; and the company descended into the court-yard. A servant held the mastiff by a chain. Pitt knelt down at a short distance from the animal, and stared him steraly in the face. They all shuddered. At a signal given, the mastiff was let loose, and rushed furiously towards Pitt, then suddenly checked his pace, seemed confounded, and, leaping over Pitt's head, ran away, and was not seen for many hours after.

"During one of my visits to Italy, while I was walking, a little before my carriage, on the road, not far from Vicenza, I perceived two huge dogs, nearly as tall as myself, bounding towards me (from out a gate-way, though there was no house in sight). I recollected what Pitt had done; and trembling from head to foot, I yet had resolution enough to stand quite still and eye them with a fixed look. They gradually relaxed their speed from a gallop to a trot, came up to me, stopped for a moment, and then went back again."

Such facts ought to be registered; but, as before hinted, we doubt the explanation; it is not the fixed look which confounds the animal, but the unusual *attitude*. Dogs are not accustomed to be attacked by men kneeling before them, or standing motionless. That puts them out. An Indian officer once informed us that he was with a sepoy in the jungle, when they espied a tiger crouching and about to spring; the sepoy instantly crouched likewise, and, placing his two hands trumpetwise before his lips, shouted: in another instant the tiger was heard crash, crash, crash, leaping through the jungle. The explanation seems to be that the tiger was alarmed by this unaccustomed mode of defence. Certain it is that in the East, where dogs in troops rush out upon the traveller like so many wolves, the only safety is in seating oneself on the ground, and laying aside the stick or gun. The dogs form a circle round you, but will not attack you so long as you remain thus motionless. Curiously enough Homer has, in the Odyssey, noticed this very custom. When Ulysses returns home, and goes to his shepherds, the dogs all rush out upon him, barking furiously; but "Ulysses craftily seated himself, and laid aside his staff."

Οι μεν κεκληγωτες επεδημαον· αυταρ Οδυσσευς
Εζετο κερδοσυνῃ, σκηπτρον δε οι εκπεσε χειρος.

Now Ulysses could not have fixed them *all* with his eye. Apropos of Homer, an example of his accurate observation will be worth quoting from this volume:

"Some traveller relates, that an Indian being asleep in his canoe, which was fastened to the shore, a little above the Falls of Niagara, an English soldier wantonly cut the fastenings, and the canoe drifted into the current; that the Indian, after vainly trying the use of his paddles, and perceiving that he was just approaching the Falls, covered his head with his mat, lay down in the canoe, and calmly resigned himself to his fate. So Homer, following nature, tells us in the *Odyssey*, that Ulysses, when his companions had opened the bag which contained the winds, covered his head with his mantle, and lay down in the vessel."

Here is a glorious *mot* of Sydney Smith's:

"Miss Lydia White (long since dead) was a lady who delighted in giving parties to as many celebrated people as she could collect. The following instance of her readiness in reply was communicated to me by my friend, the Rev. W. Harness. 'At one of Lydia White's small and most agreeable dinners, in Park street, the company (most of them, except the hostess, being Whigs) were discussing, in rather a querulous strain, the desperate prospects of their party. "Yes," said Sydney Smith, "we are in a most deplorable condition: we must do something to help ourselves; I think we had better sacrifice a Tory virgin." This was pointedly addressed to Lydia White, who, at once catching and applying the allusion to Iphigenia, answered, "I believe there is nothing the Whigs would not do *to raise the wind*."'"

Lydia's reply was smart, and must have made them laugh, but the flavour and humour of sacrificing a Tory virgin is of a much higher strain.

Charles James Fox in his "hot youth":

"Fox (in his earlier days, I mean), Sheridan, Fitzpatrick, &c., led *such* a life! Lord Tankerville assured me that he has played cards with Fitzpatrick at Brooks's from ten o'clock at night till near six o'clock the next afternoon, a waiter standing by to tell them 'whose deal it was,' they being too sleepy to know.

"After losing large sums at hazard, Fox would go home—not to destroy himself, as his friends sometimes feared, but—to sit down quietly and read Greek.

"He once won about eight thousand pounds: and one of his bond-creditors, who soon heard of his good luck, presented himself, and asked for payment. 'Impossible, sir,' replied Fox; 'I must first discharge my debts of honour.' The bond-creditor remonstrated. 'Well, sir, give me your bond.' It was delivered to Fox, who tore it in pieces and threw them into the fire. 'Now, sir,' said Fox, 'my debt to you is a debt of honour'; and immediately paid him."

Another glimpse of Fox:

"I saw Lunardi make the first ascent in a balloon which had been witnessed in England. It was from the Artillery ground. Fox was there with his brother General F. The crowd was immense. Fox, happening to put his hand down to his watch, found another hand upon it, which he immediately seized. 'My friend,' said he to the owner of the strange hand, 'you have chosen an occupation which will be your ruin at last.' 'O, Mr. Fox,' was the reply, 'forgive me, and let me go! I have been driven to this course by necessity alone; my wife and children are starving at home.' Fox, always tender-hearted, slipped a guinea into the hand, and then released it. On the conclusion of the show, Fox was proceeding to look what o'clock it was. 'Good God,' cried he, 'my watch is gone!' 'Yes,' answered General F., 'I know it is; I saw your friend take it.' 'Saw him take it! and you made no attempt to stop him?' 'Really, you and he appeared to be on such good terms with each other, that I did not choose to interfere.'"

Chesterfield certainly ought not to be robbed of two such witticisms as these:

"Witticisms are often attributed to the wrong people. It was Lord Chesterfield, not Sheridan, who said, on occasion of a certain marriage, that 'Nobody's son had married Everybody's daughter.'

"Lord Chesterfield remarked of two persons dancing a minuet, that 'they looked as if they were hired to do it, and were doubtful of being paid.'

"I once observed to a Scotch lady, 'how desirable it was in any danger *to have presence of mind*!' 'I had rather,' she rejoined, 'have *absence of body*.'"

With the next anecdote we must cease quoting—for this week at least:

"I have several times stayed at Oatlands with the Duke and Duchess of York—both of them most amiable and agreeable persons. We were generally a company of about fifteen; and our being invited to remain there 'another day' sometimes depended on the ability of our royal host and hostess to raise sufficient money for our entertainment. We used to have all sorts of ridiculous 'fun' as we roamed about the grounds. The Duchess kept (besides a number of dogs for which there was a regular burial-place) a collection of monkeys, each of which had its own pole with a house at top. One of the visitors (whose name I forget) would single out a particular monkey, and play to it on the fiddle with such fury and perseverance, that the poor animal, half distracted, would at last take refuge in the arms of Lord Alvanley. Monk Lewis was a great favourite at Oatlands. One day, after dinner, as the Duchess was leaving the room, she whispered something into Lewis's ear. He was much affected, his eyes filling with tears. We asked what was the matter. 'Oh,' replied Lewis 'the Duchess spoke so very kindly to me!' 'My dear fellow,' said Colonel Armstrong, 'pray don't cry; I daresay she did n't mean it.'"

ENGLISH LAWS OF PROPERTY AS THEY AFFECT WOMEN.

To the Honourable the House of Commons, in Parliament assembled,
The Petition of the Undersigned Women of Great Britain, Married and Single,

HUMBLY SHEWETH—That the manifold evils occasioned by the present law, by which the property and earnings of the wife are thrown into the absolute power of the husband, becomes daily more apparent. That the sufferings thereupon ensuing, extend over all classes of society. That it might once have been deemed for the middle and upper ranks a comparatively theoretical question, but is so no longer, since married women of education are entering on every side the fields of literature and art, in order to increase the family income by such exertions.

That it is usual when a daughter marries in these ranks, to make, if possible, some distinct pecuniary provision for her and her children, and to secure the money thus set aside by a cumbrous machinery of Trusteeship, proving that few parents are willing entirely to entrust the welfare of their offspring to the irresponsible power of the husband, to the chances of his character, his wisdom, and his success in a profession.

That another device for the protection of women, who can afford to appeal, exists in the action of the Courts of Equity, which attempt within certain limits to redress the deficiencies of the Law; but that trustees may prove dishonest or unwise in the management of the funds entrusted to their care, and Courts of Equity may fail in adjusting differences which concern the most intimate and delicate relation of life; that legal devices, patched upon a law which is radically unjust, can only work clumsily, and that here, as in many other departments of justice, a clearance of the ground is the chief thing necessary. That, since this is a truth, which has gradually come to be recognised in regard to protective restrictions upon trade, to titles of property in land, and to the legal machinery for conveying such property from one owner to another, &c., we would hope that before long it will also come to be recognised in matrimonial legislation.

That it is proved by well-known cases of hardship suffered by women of station, and also by professional women earning large incomes by pursuit of the arts, how real is the injury inflicted.

That if these laws often bear heavily upon women protected by the forethought of their relatives, the social training of their husbands, and the refined customs of the rank to which they belong, how much more unequivocal is the injury sustained by women in the lower classes, for whom no such provision can be made by their parents, who possess no means of appeal to expensive legal protection, and in regard to whom the education of the husband and the habits of his associates offer no moral guarantee for tender consideration of a wife.

That whereas it is customary in manufacturing districts to employ women largely in the processes of trade, and as semptresses, laundresses, charwomen and in other multifarious occupations which cannot here be enumerated, the question must be recognised by all as of practical importance.

That newspapers constantly detail instances of marital oppression, "wife-beating," being a new compound noun lately introduced into the English language, and a crime against which English gentlemen have lately enacted stringent regulations.

But that for the robbery by a man of his wife's hard earnings there is no redress—against the selfishness of a drunken father, who wrings from a mother her children's daily bread there is no appeal. She may work from morning till night, to see the produce of her labour wrested from her and wasted in a Gin Palace, and such cases are within the knowledge of every one.

That the law, in depriving the mother of all pecuniary resources, deprives her of the power of giving schooling to her children, and in other ways providing for their moral and physical welfare; it obliges her, in short, to leave them to the temptations of the street, so fruitful in juvenile crime.

That there are certain portions of the law of husband and wife which bear unjustly on the husband, as, for instance, that of making him responsible for his wife's debts contracted before marriage, even although he may have had no fortune with her. Her power also after marriage, of contracting debts in the name of her husband, for which he is responsible, is too unlimited, and often produces much injustice.

That in rendering the husband responsible for the entire maintenance of his family, the law expresses the necessities of an age, when the man was the only money-getting agent; but that since the custom of the country has greatly changed in this respect the position of the female sex, the law of maintenance no longer meets the whole case. That since modern civilization, in indefinitely extending the sphere of occupation for women, has in some measure broken down their pecuniary dependence upon men, it is time that legal protection be thrown over the produce of their labour, and that in entering the state of marriage, they no longer pass from freedom into the condition of a slave, all whose earning belong to his master and not to himself.

That the laws of various foreign countries are in this respect much more just than our own, and afford precedent for a more liberal legislation than prevails in England—and your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will take the foregoing allegations into consideration, and apply such remedy as to its wisdom shall seem fit—

And your petitioners will ever pray.

LADIES SANCTIONING THE ABOVE.

Anna Blackwell, Isa Blagden, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Sarianna Browning, Mrs. Cowden Clarke, Charlotte Cushman, Amelia B. Edwards, Eliza F. Fox, Mrs. Gaskell, Matilda M. Hays, Mary Howitt, Anna Mary Howitt, Mrs. Jameson, Harriet Martineau, Hon. Julia Maynard, Mary Mohl, Bessie Rayner Parkes, Mrs. Reid, Miss Sturch, Mrs. Carlyle, Miss Jewsbury, Mrs. Lovell, Mrs. Loudon, Miss Leigh Smith.

From Putnam's Magazine, for February.

THE RANGER.

BY JOHN G. WHITTIER.

Robert Rawlin! Frosts were falling
When the ranger's horn was calling
Through the woods to Canada.
Gone the Winter's sleet and snowing,
Gone the Spring time's bud and blowing,
Gone the Summer's harvest mowing,
And again the fields are gray.
Yet away, he's away,
Faint and fainter hope is growing
In the hearts that mourn his stay.

Where the lion, crouching high on
Abraham's rock with teeth of iron,
Glares o'er wood and wave away;
Faintly thence, as pines far sighing,
Or, as thunder spent and dying,
Come the challenge and replying,
Come the sounds of flight and fray.
Well-a-day! Hope and pray!
Some are living, some are lying
In their red graves far away.

Straggling rangers, worn with dangers,
Homeward faring, weary strangers
Pass the farm gate on their way;
Tidings of the dead and living,
Forest march and ambush giving,
Till the maidens leave their weaving,
And the lads forget their play.
"Still away, still away!"
Sighs a sad one, sick with grieving,
"Why does Robert still delay?"

Nowhere fairer, sweeter, rarer,
Does the golden-locked fruit bearer
Through his planted woodlands stray,
Than where hill-side oaks and beeches
Overlook the long, blue reaches,
Silver coves and pebbled beaches
And green isles of Casco Bay;
Nowhere day, for delay,
With a tenderer look beseeches,
"Let me with my charmed earth stay!"

On the grainlands of the mainlands,
Stands the serried corn like train-bands,
Plume and pennon rustling gay;
Out at sea, the islands wooded,
Silver birches, golden hooded,
Set with maples, crimson-blooded,
White sea-foam and sand-hills gray,
Stretch away, far away,
Dim and dreary, over brooded
By the hazy Autumn day.

Gaily chattering to the clattering
Of the brown nuts downward pattering,
Leap the squirrels, red and gray.
On the grass land, on the fallow,
Drop the apples, red and yellow;
Drop the russet pears and mellow,
Drop the red leaves all the day.
And away, swift away
Sun and cloud, o'er hill and hollow
Chasing, weave their web of play.

"Martha Mason, Martha Mason,
Prithee tell us of the reason
Why you mope at home to-day;
Surely smiling is not sinning:
Leave your quilling, leave your spinning;
What is all your store of linen,
If your heart is never gay?
Come away, come away!
Never yet did sad beginning
Make the task of life a play."

Overbending, till she's blending
With the flaxen skein's she's tending,
Pale brown tresses smoothed away
From her face of patient sorrow,
Sits she, asking but to borrow
From the trembling hope of morrow,
Solace for the weary day—
"Go your way; laugh and play;
Unto him who heeds the sparrow
And the lilly, let me pray."

"With our rally rings the valley—
Join us!" cried the blue-eyed Nelly;
"Join us!" cried the laughing May,
"To the beach we all are going,
And, to save the task of rowing,
West by north the wind is blowing,
Blowing briskly down the bay!
Come away, come away!
Time and tide are swiftly flowing,
Let us take them while we may!

"Never tell us that you'll fail us,
Where the purple beach-plum mellows
On the bluffs so wild and gray.
Hasten, for the oars are falling;
Hark, our merry mates are calling:
Time it is that we were all in,
Singing tideward down the bay!"
"Nay, nay, let me stay;
Sore and sad for Robert Rawlin,
Is my heart," she said, "to-day."

"Vain your calling for Rob Rawlin,
Some red squaw his moose-meat's broiling,
Or some French lass, singing gay;
Just forget, as he's forgetting;
What avails a life of fretting?
If some stars must needs be setting,
Others rise as good as they."
"Cease, I pray; go your way!"
Martha cries, her eye-lids wetting,
"Foul and false the words you say!"

"Martha Mason, heed no reason,
Prithee, put a kinder face on!"
"Cease to vex me," did she say:
"Better at his side be lying,
With the mournful pine tree sighing,
And the wild birds o'er us crying,
Than to doubt like many a prey;
While away, far away,
Turns my heart, forever trying
Some new hope for each new day;

"When the shadows veil the meadows,
And the sunset's golden ladders
Climb the twilight's walls of gray—
From the window of my dreaming,
I can see his sickle gleaming,
Cheery-voiced, can hear him teeming
Down the locust-shaded way;
But away, swift away
Fades the fond, delusive seeming,
And I kneel, again to pray.

"When the growing dawn is showing,
And the barn-yard cock is crowing,
And the horned moon pales away:
From a dream of him awaking,
Every sound my heart is making
Seems a footstep of his taking;
Then I hush the thought, and say,
'Nay, nay, he's away!'
Ah! my heart, my heart is breaking
For the dear one far away."

Look up Martha! worn and swarthy
Glows a face of manhood worthy;
"Robert!" "Martha!" all they say.
O'er went wheel and reel together,
Little cared the owner whither;
Heart of lead is heart of feather,
Noon of night is noon of day!
Come away, come away!
When such lovers meet each other,
Why should prying idlers stay?

Bare the timbers, quench the embers
Of their red leaves, in December's
Hoary rime and chilly spray.
But the hearth shall kindle clearer,
Household welcomes sound sincerer,
Heart to loving heart draw nearer,
When the bridal bells shall say:
"Hope and pray, trust alway;
Life is sweeter, love is dearer
For the trial and delay!"

DEATH OF HEINE.

HEINE is dead! After many years of acute suffering, borne not with stoic firmness, but with epicurean gayety, his body paralyzed for all action but sensitive for all pain; his eyes even lacking vision, his brain alone vivid and active to the last, at last yielded its hold on his brilliant intelligence on Monday. In his last moments he requested that silence should be kept about his coffin. Accordingly neither the voice of religion nor of friendly eulogy was heard at his grave. He was buried yesterday in the cemetery of Montmatre. Of the man Heine the best thing, perhaps now to be said is Judge not!

"Judge not: the workings of his brain
And of his heart thou canst not see;
What looks to thy dim eyes a stain,
In God's pure light may only be
A scar, brought from some well-won field
Where thou wouldst only faint and yield."

Deep scars and ever open wounds he must have borne about him. A German, he was an exile from the country of his birth. A Jew by blood, he was a stranger in Christendom. Not a Jew in his faith, he was an exile from Jewry. Sheridan's comparison of such to the blank leaf between the Old and New Testament is as sadly as it is wittily apt. On this hopelessly blank leaf poor Heine inscribed at one time unstable creeds of speculative philosophy. Latterly they seem to have disappeared of themselves—being in some sort suicidal and teaching their own uncertainty. One cardinal point always remained, however, whether the rest of the page were the *tabula rasa* of thorough skepticism, or bore a pantheistic or other theory—that cardinal point of his faith was *the Beautiful*. Above and before and through all, Heine was an artist. He should have been born in Greece two thousand years ago. Goethe said that he wanted *love*, wherein I humbly beg to differ from that grand old heathen, who was not himself specially inspired with that quality. If the Master had placed his weakness in his want of calmness, no objection could be made. Perhaps Goethe did not say this. It is Eckermann who makes the report. It is true that Goethe had small reason to speak kindly of Heine, and Eckermann had less. I must not attempt a criticism of Heine, or a review of his writings. I will only quote what Eckermann makes Goethe say against him, and quote the best answer to it from Heine himself:

"It cannot be denied (says Goethe) that he possesses many brilliant qualities, but he wants one thing—Love. * * * As I said, he is altogether destitute of Love, and without that, nothing can be done."

Now among the lesser things that Heine has done, gently, lovingly, with humane and natural sympathy, is the following picture. I translate literally, from his Reisebilder, page 168 of the third Hamburg edition, and the translation is worth reading, although I cannot bring over into my English, the music of the original.

"Judging by the sun, it was noonday, when I came upon such a herd [he is travelling on foot in the Harz], and the Herdsman, a good-natured, fair complexioned young man told me, that the mountain at whose foot I stood, was the old, world-renowned Brocken. There is no house for many miles around, and I was glad enough when the young man invited me to eat with him. We sat down to a *dejuner dinatoire*, that consisted of bread and cheese. The lambs snapped up crumbs we let fall, the pretty, sleek-coated heifers played around us, and tinkled roguishly with their little bells, and smiled on us with their great contented eyes. We sat at meat right royally. My host seemed to me a real king, and as he chances to be the only king who has ever given me bread, I will sing him royally.

"A king is the herds boy,
The green hill is his throne,
Above his head the sun
Is the heavy, golden crown.

"At his feet lie the sheep,
Soft flatterers, red-crossed,
Knights are the calves,
And they strut along proudly.

"Court-players are the goats
And the birds and the king—
With their flutes, with their bells—
Are the royal king's orchestra.

"And it rings and sings so sweetly,
And sweetly chime therewith
Water-fall and fir-tree murmur—
And the king falls asleep.

"Meanwhile there must rule
The Minister, yonder dog,
Whose gruff barking
Re-echoes round about.

"Drowsily murmurs the young king:
'Ruling is so difficult,
Ah, I wish that I at home
Were now at my queen's side!

"'In the arms of my queen,
Resting my royal head so softly,
And in her dear eyes
Lies my boundless realm!'"

—*Correspondent of N. Y. Tribune.*

A PLEA FOR PEACE.

COMMON politics lie beyond our province. We gladly leave to our powerful and sagacious contemporaries the duty of vindicating our rank in the scale of nations. We concern ourselves slightly with the rights of men and the wrongs of women. Even the Russian War has had for us only a secondary interest. Our labours fall, very happily for ourselves and for our readers, in the calmer regions of intelligence—regions rarely disturbed by intrusion of the fiercer passions, and across which the flash of battle passes as a softened light, and the roar of bombardment is only heard in a sad and mournful monotone. Before we can deal with politics, they must generally have passed into history. But there are exceptions to our rule; and the question of a possible rupture with America is certainly one of these exceptions. Surely such a rupture is unlikely! Yet the air grows heavier day by day. The idea is becoming familiar to many minds. Passions are rising. Every mail appears to bring us nearer to the cataract; and unless the good and moderate men of both hemispheres come to the rescue of their governments, a collision may take place. Under such an aspect of events, every voice to which the public will listen should be raised. The more cautiously we ourselves abstain in ordinary times from pronouncing on the course of our national policy, the more we feel bound in this solemn moment to appeal to the true feeling and sedate understanding of our readers on both sides of the Atlantic against the levity, the pride, or the incapacity which would urge the two nations into war.

War with the United States! The idea of such a war is incredible. If there be in the catalogue of mortal calamities a "worse than Civil War," it is such a conflict as might arise between America and England. A civil war has generally some basis in reason. Some grand principle is at stake. The sword is drawn in defence of freedom—in defence of property—in defence of religion. As in our own civil war, a certain degree of romance, of chivalry, and of intellectual activity, often springs from the conflict and flourishes after its close—the blossom and the fruit of a splendid and deadly contest. But a war against America would have no single redeeming point. There is not—and there never ought to be—any real ground of quarrel with the United States. The interests of the two countries are identical. Their moral principles are the same. They have neither a language to separate nor a religion to estrange them. The same blood flows in the veins of their people. They have a common history—a common literature—a common tradition. They possess the same Bible. They read the same Shakspeare and the same Milton. Blake conquered and Cromwell ruled for both. They have an equal interest in Raleigh, in Vane, and in Penn. Nay, their present state is as inseparable as their past. They still live by the light of the same old Saxon laws. They still drink at the same intellectual fountains, regardless whether the springs lie on the eastern or the western shores of the Atlantic. Irving, Bryant, Bancroft, Hawthorne, Longfellow are admired with as warm an affection in England as are Thackeray, Tennyson, Dickens, Jerrold, and Macaulay in America. A war between England and America would be a war of brothers—a war of friend against friend. It would be a war against the affinities of race, against the unity of religion, against the interchanges of trade. It would be a war in favour of barbarism, piracy, restriction—a war against the bounties of Nature, the enterprises of genius, the advances of civilization. Such a war would bring sorrow into every Anglo-Saxon home in Europe and America, and a feeling of shame and humiliation into every Anglo-Saxon heart, in whatever quarter of the globe it beats. Such a war would close the Gospel for nearly half the Christian world!

We say nothing about material interests. They go for much; but the moral interests far outweigh them. The interchange of thought is more important than the interchange of cotton. And for what are we threatened with an interruption of our friendly relations with our American kindred? Is any principle at issue? Are our liberties threatened—is our property unsafe? Not in the least degree. Only three slight and miserable causes for quarrel appear—a dispute about the construction of a treaty regarding that interesting savage, the King of Mosquito—a dispute about some wretched sandbanks lying off Belize—and a dispute about the attempt to enlist troops for the Crimea. The first two are quite insignificant. We might as well go to war about the sovereignty of Eel-Pie Island. We may be right or we may be wrong in our interpretation: the Americans think we are wrong. There is much to be said on both sides; and we all know that when private persons disagree about trifles, a courteous and conciliatory tone soon removes the cause of quarrel. About the third point—the attempt to enlist in the Republican territory—we are unquestionably in the wrong. In neither case is our honour engaged; in neither case does any principle which ought to be maintained stand behind the formal terms of the disagreement—thus presenting a true ground of quarrel, as in the Russian War, which the genius of the nation can seize and accept. Our statesmen might—and must—find in the resources of diplomacy a means of satisfying all interests without an insane appeal to the sword. Where we are clearly wrong, we should at once and fully admit our error, making whatever reparation is fairly due. It is said the Washington Cabinet requires the withdrawal of Mr. Crampton. Surely this is no extreme or revolutionary request. Personal unpopularity has always been considered a sufficient reason for requiring the withdrawal of an ambassador. We could give a hundred instances in which sovereign powers have exercised this right. Under such circumstances withdrawal does not imply censure. It merely implies that the personal relations of the ruler and the minister have become such as to impede the transaction of public business. We were wrong in attempting to recruit within the Union. Mr. Crampton was the instrument of the wrong. He has thereby rendered himself an object of suspicion at Washington. His withdrawal, therefore, at the request of the American Cabinet, would be in accordance with usage, and would be a sure pledge of the sincerity of our acknowledgment of the original error. Strong nations can afford to be graceful in their concessions.

The other points are less clear. Yet, if a proper spirit of conciliation presides at the discussion, we have no reason to fear a permanent disagreement. We have a right to expect that our diplomatists and public writers will approach the discussion in a pacific mood. Above all things, we deprecate a menacing tone. We cannot read without indignation the elaborate display of our naval and military powers which some of our journals have thought proper to make. Every Englishman feels that he would not be put down by such a parade; and we must not forget that our descendants in America are just as haughty as ourselves. They have our blood, our passions, our acute sense of personal honour. Against ourselves the threat of force is the one argument that is sure, under all circumstances, to fail. Nor will the Americans be cowed by a menace of the Baltic fleet. We must argue our point as if no fleets were in existence, and take our stand on the ground of history and reason.—*London Athenæum.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

THE CONVICT BANKERS.—It is said that Sir John Dean Paul, Bart., and Mr. Strahan, the convict bankers, are busily employed in prison, the former at tailoring, and the latter at chairmaking.

——MR. SAMUEL LOVER.—On the recommendation of Lord Palmerston, the Queen has conferred a pension of £100 per annum on Dr. Samuel Lover, the popular Irish novelist and song writer.

——THE FIRST NEWSPAPER.—It is stated in a foreign periodical that the first printed newspaper of which any trace can be found, was printed in 1455, and gave intelligence of the peace of Karaman with the King of Cyprus, and the conquest of Servia by the Turks in 1454. This statement is made by E. Grochet of Brussels, from a marginal note in the handwriting of Adrian de But, a Dutch monkish writer of the fifteenth century.

——The *Cork Constitution* mentions the fact that Mrs. Gore's novel, "The Banker's Wife," of which the villany of an unprincipled banker forms the ground-work, was dedicated to Sir John D. Paul, as an illustrious example of probity and good faith, and one in whom the office of banker was made honourable. Mrs. Gore is a creditor of Sir John D. Paul's bank, it is said, for £30,000, in which are included the gains by her voluminous writings. The baronet is one of the bankers recently sentenced to transportation for fourteen years.

——LAST LINES OF THE POET ROGERS.—I enclose a curiosity—some lines written by Rogers within the last two years. The friend who favours me with them says: "I quote them from memory, just as I heard them from his own lips, as I sat beside him at Brighton watching their progress:

TO A FRIEND ON HIS MARRIAGE.

"Forth to the altar, and with her thou lovest,
With her who longs to strew thy path with flowers,
Nor lose the blessed privilege to give
Birth to a race immortal as your own—
That, trained by you, may make a heaven on earth,
And tread the path that leads from earth to heaven.
S. ROGERS, ætat. 91."

—*London Correspondent of the Inverness Courier.*

——PERFUMES CONSUMED IN EUROPE AND INDIA.—British India and Europe consume annually, at the very lowest estimate 150,000 gallons! of perfumed spirits, under various titles, such as eau de Cologne, essence of lavender, esprit de rose, &c. The art of perfumery does not, however, confine itself to the production of scents for the handkerchief and bath, but extends to imparting odours to inodorous bodies, such as soap, oil starch, and grease, which are consumed at the toilet of fashion. Some idea of the commercial importance of this art may be formed, when we state that one of the largest consummers of Grasse and Paris employs annually 80,000 lb. of orange flowers, 60,000 lb. of cassia flowers, 54,000 lb. of rose leaves, 32,000 lb. of jasmine blossoms, 32,000 lb. of violets, 20,000 lb. of tuberose, 18,000 lb. of lilac, besides rosemary, mint, lemon, citron, thyme, and other odorous plants in larger proportion. In fact, the quantity of odoriferous substances used in this way is far beyond the conception of those even used to abstract statistics.

——"Children's books" are now totally different in character to those which we obtained in the days of our boyhood. There has literally just been published a child's volume, containing an account of the French Revolution of 1848—the Chartist Meeting of the 10th of April in the same year—the Great Exhibition—the Gold Fields of Australia—the Duke's Death—the Spanish Revolution—Sir John Franklin's Expedition—the Cholera in England—the War with Russia, the chapters devoted to which describe the battles fought in the Crimea, gives extracts from letters from the Camp, together with an account of the Emperor Nicholas's death. After these things, we have Vienna Conference—the Imperial Visit to England—and a variety of information respecting past and passing events, which help to make up a book for politicians! Appended to the little work is an explanation of the military terms used in speaking of military matters!

A LOTTERY SCHEME.—The *Journal du Loiret* relates the following scheme resorted to by a young damsel in order to procure a husband: "A young lady, pretty and well educated, residing in the arrondissement of Pithiviers, has conceived the idea of putting herself up to lottery. There are to be 300 tickets at 1,000f. each, and to the fortunate winner she will give herself and the 299,000f. by way of dowry. The lady has attached some very prudent conditions to the purchase of tickets. She will only sell them to persons whom she may think will suit her, and, in order to ascertain that point, she exacts a half-hour's *tête-à-tête* conversation with each applicant. There is no limit of age imposed, but no more than one ticket may be taken by one person. The lottery will be drawn on the 25th of November next at the Mairie at Pithiviers. No married men are allowed to take tickets. It is said that a number of Englishmen have already become purchasers, and applications are coming in from all quarters.

JOHNSON'S GOD-DAUGHTER.—Messrs. T. Carlyle, Charles Dickens and John Forster publish the result of their appeal on behalf of Samuel Johnson's god-daughter, the aged Miss Lowe, and her sister. The sum raised is still but a little over £250; but "on the other hand, the price of such a life annuity as was proposed proves cheaper than we anticipated; and in addition to this there has been a lucky chance come to help us somewhat. Mauritius Lowe, Miss Lowe's father, is now discovered to have been the benevolent painter by whom Turner, at that time a barber's boy, was first recognised, befriended, and saved to art, in return for which fine action an ardent and renowned admirer of Turner (whose name we need not indicate further) desires to gratify himself by bestowing henceforth £5 annually on the Misses Lowe, and permits us to publish such his resolution, if that can make it more binding. So that, on the whole, there is now as good as an 'additional annuity of £30,' which was our minimum limit, secured for these aged ladies; and thus, by one means and another, our small problem can be considered as done."

——AN IMPERIAL CRADLE.—A Paris letter in the *Independance* of Brussels states that the municipal authorities of Paris have already given orders for a magnificent cradle to be got ready for the expected infant of the Emperor and Empress. It will surpass, it is said, in taste and